The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, MAY 12, 1892.

The Week.

THE passage by Congress, with scarcely any opposition, of the bill to admit the Inman steamers *City of Paris* and *City of New York* to American registry is a notable event, and must be considered the beginning of a great reform in our shipping laws and in our commercial policy. The mere fact that the Inman Company is required to build additional ships of the same aggregate tonnage in American shipyards, is a very small price to pay for such a concession. It will be impossible henceforth to resist the petition of other American citizens who own foreign-built ships to have them put under the flag of their own country. It will be impossible long to resist the petition of other American citizens to be put on a footing of equality with foreigners in respect of the ocean carrying trade. What an anomaly and injustice it is which allows British, Norwegian, Chinese, Hawaiian, and all other ships to come to our ports and fetch and carry all kinds of goods for such freight money as they can get, but denies to our own people the right to own these very ships *unless* they are sailed under a foreign flag. You may own a British-built ship and sail it under the flag of San Domingo as long as you please, carrying American products out and foreign products back, but you cannot get the protection of your own country for your property. The negroes of San Domingo can come here with British-built ships and enter into competition with our people in the ocean carrying trade without the slightest restraint, but our own people cannot buy a British ship and get an American registry for it on any terms. The glaring injustice of this discrimination against our citizens must make itself felt ere long, now that Congress has taken *one* step in the right direction. It is said that the admission of the two Inman steamers was due to the galling discovery, at the time of the Chilian difficulty, that we had no swift transports capable of being armed. If this is the true explanation, it is the only good thing that the Chilian difficulty has brought us.

No party seems to be proof against the temptations of the River and Harbor Bill, with its almost innumerable slices of "pork." Ten years ago a Republican Congress passed what was the largest grab of the sort then ever known, and passed it again over President Arthur's veto. The following autumn the party was buried beneath a "tidal wave," which was largely swollen by the popular indignation at this piece of extravagance. Two years ago another Republican Congress passed a river and harbor bill far worse than that which Arthur vetoed, and the next November the party was buried even deeper than it had been in the days when Keifer was Speaker. The Democrats came into power pledged to economy in all appropriations, and yet on Monday 122 Democrats voted for, and only 58 against, a river and harbor bill which carries appropriations immediately available amounting to nearly $22,000,000, and fixes a liability upon the Government for future appropriations of almost $27,000,000, This, too, not only in violation of party pledges, but in face of the fact that the revenues of the Government are not now sufficient to meet the ordinary expenditures, and that new taxes will have to be imposed to pay for this debauch! As all but four of the sixty-three Republicans voting supported the bill, there is no reason to doubt that the Republican Senate will pass it, very likely after adding a good deal to its total. In that case we hope President Harrison will follow the example of his Republican predecessor and send in a veto.

Senator Sherman fought to the end against the barbarous spirit manifested by the majority of both branches of Congress in regard to the Chinese question. He refused to sign the report of the Committee of Conference, explaining that he fully sympathized with the popular feeling against the free introduction of Chinese laborers, but that he regarded the provision requiring every Chinaman now legally here to take out a certificate, under penalty of removal from the country, as in plain violation of the existing treaty with China. Representative Hitt was equally outspoken against the report of the Conference Committee in the House. But, of course, arguments were without avail, for the majority of both parties seem to believe that it is right to "trample upon a treaty," so long as it is a treaty with Chinamen. Two-thirds of the Senate voted to sustain the report of the Conference Committee, and the House concurred by the overwhelming vote of 185 yeas to 28 nays. And we are sending missionaries to convert the Chinese to such Christianity as this!

The passage and signing of the Chinese Exclusion Bill came in very pat with the missionary meeting of the Methodist General Conference at Omaha on Friday, and the occasion was not lost for addressing some very plain words to the politicians who passed the law and the President who approved it. And it is to be remembered that the Methodist speakers simply expressed the sentiments of all the religious bodies in the country. The others will no doubt be equally outspoken on the subject when they come to pass upon it officially. The assertion made at Omaha that "our mission in China is gravely impeded by this law" is just as true of Presbyterian and Congregationalist and Baptist missions as it is of Methodist. This sect may have been a little more impetuous and unparliamentary than Mr. Harrison's own denomination will be in referring to the matter, yet there are thousands of Presbyterians who will agree with the utterance of Dr. Edwards: "This is a sop to the steerages of the vessels that are being unloaded at the Battery. It is a political question, and that is why our noble Senators and our most unimpeachable President complete the iniquitous proceedings." When a Senator, Mr. Harrison spoke and voted on the Chinese question like a civilized man. As candidate for the Presidency, he had to repudiate the most honorable part of his record. As candidate for renomination, he has to put his name to a law which is in flagrant violation of a treaty, which was properly described by an excited Methodist at the Conference as "an outrage on civilization," and which, moreover, will subject hundreds of Americans in China to the gravest perils.

A bill, which was prepared by the American Institute of Architects, is pending in Congress, and ought to be made a law. It provides for a radical change in the methods at present followed in regard to the designs for Government buildings, by authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to obtain plans, drawings, specifications, and local supervision for such buildings by the system of competitive examination among private architects. Not less than five architects shall be asked to compete for the designs for one building, and the one whose plans are approved may be asked to superintend the construction. The Supervising Architect of the Treasury is to remain the representative of the Government in all matters connected with the work of erecting public buildings, being the supervising power over all proposals, material, and contracts, and also over the plans and specifications of local architects. His powers will remain as they are at present, with the exception that he will not prepare the drawings and specifications. He will be made, in fact, the kind of official which his title designates—a supervisor of the architecture of Government buildings, not the architect of them.

What the bill does, is to call to the service of the Government the architectural talent of the whole country, in order that the best of that ability may be used in giving the United States public buildings which will be, in every way, artistically and economically, a credit to us as a nation. Everybody knows that this is not the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

case at present. That it is not so is not the fault of the Supervising Architect. He has a task entirely beyond human capacity to perform. In a report favoring the proposed bill, Mr. Tarsney, Chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, says very truly that "it need not be urged that it is physically impossible for one man to devote sufficient thought and time to the proper designing and preparation of plans and specifications for fifty or sixty buildings each year which in their artistic expression shall be creditable to the nation, to the age, and to the architectural genius of the country, and that, in the economy of construction, shall do justice to those from whom the cost of such construction is drawn." He reports that the Committee has been furnished with trustworthy data showing that the cost of public buildings in this country ranges from fifty cents to a dollar per cubic foot, against from thirty-eight to fifty cents in foreign countries, and adds:

> "Another very serious evil is the length of time required to construct and complete one of these buildings. A building which, if the property of a private citizen, would be constructed in months, when erected by the Government requires years for its completion. This necessarily results in great wastefulness and loss of money to the Government by the payment of unnecessary salaries of superintendents and other agents, by the expense of watching and caring for the materials and structure, and by the loss, waste, and deterioration of such material, besides the inconvenience to the citizens resulting from such delayed construction. As an illustration of the extent to which this evil may extend under present methods, your Committee would call your attention to the last annual report of the Supervising Architect in relation to the public building at Detroit, Mich., where the construction was authorized eleven years ago, and $1,300,000 therefor has been appropriated by Congress years since, and the foundation walls are not yet completed."

The truth of all this is notorious. Combined with extravagant and poor construction, we have almost invariably a style of architecture which is a libel on the artistic intelligence of the country, and a type of building which nine times out of ten is totally unfitted for the uses to which it is put. It is high time that the present system was changed. The country outgrew it years ago, and nobody whose opinion is worth considering favors its retention.

If there has ever been a disposition in the Eastern States to sneer at the West as a region destitute of culture and absorbed in purely material interests, the platform adopted last week by the Democrats of Wisconsin gives notice to the world that the day for such sneers is past. It may be emphatically said that any community which frames and accepts a platform of this character has reached a high state of political development, and sound political development is the best proof of true progress in civilization. In this platform we have as clear and strong a declaration of those principles which are, after all, fundamental to the Democratic party as language is capable of expressing. There is no buncombe or verbiage about it, no hypocrisy or evasion. There is no doubt what it means. It is as explicit in its statement of what it condemns as in its statement of what it approves. It is generally supposed that a platform is of very little consequence, and most platforms are of such a character as to justify this belief. The Wisconsin platform, however, is such a bugle-blast for sound government as may well be worth ten thousand men.

The most important planks are of course those relating to silver. The denunciation of the disgraceful law of 1890 is like a blow delivered straight from the shoulder and striking squarely between the eyes. That act, it is declared, is a cowardly makeshift, and an inexcusable waste of the national resources in the purchase and storage of tons of bullion per day, and is a menace to the maintenance of a sound and stable currency. Not only is its repeal demanded, but the position is unequivocally taken that if we are to have bimetallism, the silver dollar must have the same commercial value as the gold dollar. This is the only honest kind of bimetallism possible, and it marks a great advance in political courage when this doctrine is frankly avowed. On this subject the Wisconsin Democrats have certainly "nailed their colors to the mast." The money which they demand in the interest of the people is to be "composed of or based on and redeemable in gold and silver coin *of equal intrinsic value.*" Any disregard of this principle is justly declared to be "undemocratic, dishonest, and specially hurtful to the farmers and laboring classes, the first and most defenceless victims of unstable money and a fluctuating currency." The principle that there should be no tariff taxation except for revenue is affirmed with the same unmistakable clearness. There is nothing of that wretched makeshift, "incidental protection," nor any of the usual cant about "conserving the interests of American labor." In short, this declaration of political principles comes very near to being the truth, and nothing but the truth. If the party acts up to this platform, it will give the country good government; and where so much sincerity is shown in framing a platform, there is every reason to expect that the party will act up to it.

Three deliverances on the silver question came from Republican State conventions in the West during the past week which it is interesting to contrast. The Wisconsin brethren declare that, "while we favor the use of both gold and silver as money metals under conditions which shall guarantee their circulation at a continuing and substantial parity with each other, under existing circumstances and conditions we are unalterably opposed to the free and unlimited coinage of silver"; and they further declare that "we favor an amendment of the Silver Act of 1890 which shall vest in the President, whenever in his judgment the public interest shall demand it, power to suspend or diminish until the further action of Congress the purchase of silver bullion under said act." The Kansas Republicans, on the other hand, "urge the passage of such laws as will increase the coinage of silver, looking to the coinage of the production of our own mines, as soon as it can be done without injury to the business interests of the country." The Idaho Convention went much further, and instructed its delegates to the National Convention to "use their utmost endeavors to secure a plank in the Republican platform unequivocally pledging the party to the free and unlimited coinage of silver," and also instructed the delegates to vote for no person for President or Vice-President who is not in favor of free coinage. Evidently the Democratic party is not the only one which is divided on the silver issue.

The Republicans of Illinois and Wisconsin made last week a formal and complete surrender of the position which they took two years ago on the question of compulsory education. In 1890 the Illinois Republicans adopted a resolution saying that "we declare in favor of a compulsory-education law," while now they have adopted a resolution that "we pledge ourselves to repeal the present Compulsory School Act." In 1890 the Wisconsin Republicans declared their "belief that the compulsory-education law passed by the last Legislature is wise and humane in all its essential purposes, and we are opposed to its repeal." Having been beaten on this issue, and the "wise and humane law" having been repealed, they have now adopted a resolution that "we regard the educational issue of 1890 as permanently settled in this State, not to be revived in any of its phases by the Republican party." A more abject surrender has not been witnessed in our politics for a good many years.

Whatever explanation may be offered of the renewal of gold exports, the fact itself could not, under the circumstances, fail to cause anxiety. In spite of our abundant harvests, which should normally have resulted in a general buoyancy in the business world, a great deal of distrust and caution has been manifested, while the spirit of speculation has been absent. There is but one sufficient explanation of this state of affairs—the condition of the currency. With the law of 1890 in force, the only question to be asked is whether the increase in the population and business of the country will be sufficient to absorb $54,000,000 yearly of additional Government notes. If it will be sufficient, we are safe; for we may now feel reasonably confident that no new legislation will be worse than the present act. But if it will

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

not be sufficient, then our condition is so precarious as to justify all the caution and suspicion that exist. For if the Government is issuing more notes than are needed as money, those that are superfluous will certainly be presented for payment, and payment will be demanded in gold and not silver. Moreover, the Government must pay in gold; for if it should for a moment hesitate to do so, a panic would at once ensue.

In commenting upon the loss by the United States Treasury of nearly $6,000,000 gold during the month of April, the *Financial Chronicle* observes that this loss is doubtless chiefly due to the payment of the interest on the 4 per cent. bonds. It is true that the quarterly interest on these bonds which fell due on the 1st of April very nearly coincided in amount with the reduction in the gold reserve, but the reason is not apparent why the payment of this interest should have been demanded in gold. Of course the bondholders did not as a class want gold; they probably deposited their coupons or checks as usual, and the banks must have, for some reason, obtained gold from the Treasury upon these or other obligations. It would seem as if there must have been a demand for gold for export, or else to strengthen the bank reserves, and the real nature of this demand deserves a careful investigation. Unless it appears that the payment of the interest upon these bonds is regularly attended with a corresponding reduction of gold in the Treasury, the recent reduction must be explained by reference to some other cause.

The London *Economist* discusses at some length the project for a new international monetary conference, with special reference to the participation of England and India therein. It maintains first that Great Britain, before accepting an invitation to join in the conference, should make known distinctly how far she is willing to go, if any distance at all, so that other nations may not be deceived or led to indulge false expectations. The utmost that Mr. Goschen has hinted, up to this time, is that the Bank of England should be "advised" by the Government to take into her reserves a sum of silver equal to one-fourth of her gold, thus making the whole reserve consist of one part silver and four parts gold; this on condition that other nations shall throw open their mints to free coinage of both metals at a common ratio. But the *Economist* points out that the Bank of England, being a private corporation, is under no obligation to accept the Government's advice on this point, or, having once accepted it, to follow it for ever. It is important, the *Economist* thinks, that other nations should be made to understand these things. As to India, the suggestion is that that country shall agree to keep her mint open to silver for a certain term of years, on the same condition that the Bank of England requires for doing what she does. But what does that mean? Does it mean that if no international agreement is made, India will adopt the gold standard? Not at all, thinks the *Economist*, because the task is far too great for her. It is not to be thought of. So the participation of England and India would be of no more real consequence or significance than their participation in the Conference of 1881.

The women of Wyoming appear to maintain their interest in the suffrage. They not only vote regularly in a proportion which seems to approach that among men who are entitled to the ballot, but they take an active part in the caucuses and conventions which nominate candidates. A good many of the sex attended the recent Republican State Convention for the choice of delegates to the National Convention, and the male majority "recognized" them to the extent of giving them two places as alternates. This is somewhat after the system adopted by the Republican managers in a good many States regarding the negroes—of giving all the places as delegates to whites, and allowing the blacks only the "leavings" in the shape of election as alternates, who are not expected to serve; but, nevertheless, it must be regarded as "the entering wedge," and by 1896 the women of Wyoming may compel a "recognition" which will be of more value.

It appears from President Reynolds's report to the stockholders of the Mexican Central Railroad that the McKinley tariff has really led to the establishment of some new industries; but, unfortunately, the industries are in Mexico. It was thought by the officers of this railroad that the increase of the duty on lead ores would injure its business by making it unprofitable to import them. Apparently the smelters who were using these ores in the United States did find it unprofitable to import them after the tariff went into effect, for they transferred their works to Mexico. The railroad thus suffered some loss of freight upon ores carried to the frontier; but as it now hauls them to smelting works on its own line at better rates, and has in addition the bullion traffic and that in coal and all other supplies for the smelters, it finds that it has gained much more than it has lost. The advantage to American labor of this mode of establishing "hundreds of new industries," as the *Tribune* says, is not very apparent; but it can at least find satisfaction in the abstract principle, sustained by President Reynolds's evidence, that the McKinley tariff can produce the establishment of new industries somewhere.

It is the invariable tendency of theological controversies to push opposing views to extremes, and it is not, therefore, surprising that the present dissensions in the Presbyterian Church have driven the Princeton conservatives into a hyper-orthodoxy unknown to their fathers. The correspondence relating to the withdrawal of Prof. Van Dyke from Princeton Seminary shows that the lines are now more rigidly drawn in that institution than in the days of the Hodges themselves. It ought to give a seminary pause, we should think, to find that its zeal for sharpening distinctions of doctrine and making them tests of loyalty, results in the loss of one of its own sons and successful teachers, who maintains his entire fidelity to the creed of his Church and the old traditions of the seminary, but who refuses to ally himself with those who are endeavoring to make the institution more orthodox than the Pope. Princeton has already had the mortification of seeing several of her sons go over to the radical, or at least the liberal, party in the Church. There is nothing unprecedented about that: the most ardent innovators are usually those who have revolted from a surfeit of traditional teaching. Yet this fact does not prevent the zealots of every generation from following the example of the gods of Greece and devouring their own children.

The ministerial crisis in Italy is interpreted to mean that the country can no longer bear the expense attendant upon being a military and naval Power of the first class, and ready at all times to come to the assistance of Germany or Austria if either of them is attacked. This is what the Dreibund means. It demands of Italy pecuniary sacrifices of crushing weight, and yet there is no conclusive evidence that the country will not stagger along under the burden for some considerable time, rather than resign the place which national pride claims for her. Whatever may be the outcome of the crisis, it will be the expression of the national will, for there is not in Europe a more democratic country in fact. The forms of royalty and nobility which still exist are in strict subordination to parliamentary government. The civic instinct and patriotic pride which distinguished the Italian republics in the old times have never ceased to burn, although often seemingly quenched in blood and foreign domination. Whatever money Italy spends on fleets and armies she will spend because the taxpayers will it; not because the King and a few great families impose the charge upon them. It is to be hoped that they will abate something of the strain they have put upon themselves during the past fifteen years. It would be a great gain even for one country to make the experiment of reducing her armament, since it would enable the others to take the policy of reduction into consideration. It would open new channels of thought on the Continent of Europe, and might lead to better ideas concerning the chief end of man, which now means fighting or preparing to fight.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE PRESIDENTIAL OUTLOOK.

ALL the 900 delegates who are to compose the National Republican Convention which will meet at Minneapolis on June 7, have been elected. Of the same number who are to compose the National Democratic Convention, which will meet at Chicago on June 21, only about 400 have been chosen. There is much speculation in public by the professional politicians as to the probable action of each convention, and there are many pretences, emanating chiefly from Washington, that there is much doubt as to the candidates who will be nominated. In reality, however, there is very little doubt as to the outcome of either convention. The Republican candidate is almost certain to be President Harrison, and the Democratic candidate is equally certain to be Mr. Cleveland. Both nominations are written in the book of political destiny, and the persons who are so voluble in doubt as to the writing are either manœuvring for position, or are blindly struggling against the inevitable.

A careful table of the delegates to the Republican Convention is published by the Philadelphia *Press*, with the preferences for various candidates divided as follows: Instructed for Harrison 328, not instructed, but favorable to Harrison 312; for Blaine 50, for Alger 24, unknown 186. This estimate, as it stands, would nominate Harrison on the first ballot, for a majority is sufficient, and he is credited with more than two-thirds. But the *Press*, which has always been a devoted Blaine organ, says that the "fifty delegates placed in the Blaine column will probably find reason before this Convention meets for ranging themselves in the Harrison column, where the Alger and unknown delegates will doubtless be found also after the first ballot." This is a frank admission from an unquestioned Blaine source that there is nothing serious in the most recent effort of Platt, Quay, and the other Harrison "strikers" to revive the Blaine boom. Those political adventurers may possibly deceive themselves into thinking that they can prevent Harrison's renomination, but we doubt if they deceive anybody else, least of all the President.

On the Democratic side, the most careful estimate that we have seen of the delegates thus far chosen to the National Convention is made by the Boston *Herald*, which gives Mr. Cleveland 300 out of a total of 378. "This is, on its face," says the *Herald*, "a showing for Cleveland fully equal to what his most sanguine supporter has claimed," and "is considerably more than the necessary two-thirds proportion for him." The *Herald* adds that according to present indications there "will be not much more than a scattering opposition to Cleveland's nomination in the Convention." All the opposition that there has ever been to Cleveland's nomination had its beginning and ending in David B. Hill. If he had not used his machine to misrepresent New York sentiment in regard to Cleveland, there would not have been at any time a question as to Cleveland's nomination by acclamation. The only obstacle to such nomination which exists to-day is that which Hill's "snap" delegation presents; and the only doubt which exists in anybody's mind about the wisdom of that nomination is that which is based upon a fear that Hill treachery will prevent success at the polls. This reduces the Democratic Convention's work to a very simple question. It must decide whether or not it will allow "Dave" Hill to dictate its action. What he says is very plain. It is simply: "If you dare to nominate Grover Cleveland, I will knife him at the polls. You must either take me or some man who represents my kind of politics." There is no escape for the Convention from a decision on this point. It must take Cleveland and reject Hill and all his kind, or take Hill and reject Cleveland and all that he stands for in politics and government. Mr. Hill has forced the fighting on this issue, and has made dodging of any kind impossible.

It is for this reason that Mr. Cleveland's nomination has for many weeks seemed to us to be a certainty. For the party to refuse to nominate him would be to make public confession that it had neither principles nor character, but was hopelessly in the power of a gang of political brigands who regarded its sole mission to be the pursuit of spoils and public plunder. It is a great mistake to say that the Mugwumps are "dictating" Cleveland's nomination. They have had no hand in the present controversy, but have viewed it with more or less indifference from the outset. All the "dictating" has come from the Hillites, who have taken the party by the throat and have threatened to strangle it if it persists in trying to be honest and decent and worthy the support of intelligent and public-spirited men. The Mugwumps have regarded this struggle as a family matter, and have been awaiting the outcome philosophically. If the Democratic party thinks it can get along without the aid of independent votes, it can be certain of ridding itself of them by allowing the Hill brigands to control its councils.

The position of New York politicians towards the probable nominees of both parties is curious and instructive. Hill and his followers are threatening to knife Cleveland if he is nominated, and Platt and Miller are threatening to withdraw from politics and let somebody else run the Republican campaign if Harrison is renominated. If both parties could be rid for ever of the politicians who make these threats, it would be a good thing for them and an immense gain for the cause of good government in this State. Hill on one side and Platt on the other have reduced New York politics to a mere scramble for spoils and plunder, and have driven from the councils and leadership of both parties all men of first-rate ability and high principle. It is fitting that, so far as Presidential nominations are concerned, the New York delegation of either party should have little or no influence in determining the choice.

REPUBLICAN FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT.

THE platform of the New York Republicans this year asserts that "the people must continue to look to the Republican party to maintain the good faith of the nation in all matters of finance." This is but a faint echo of those vigorous warnings against Democratic financiering which used to appear in Republican platforms ten or fifteen years ago. Yet, after four years of actual Democratic control of the finances, the only charge against it which the Republicans could make in 1888 was that it had made "efforts to demonetize silver." This policy the national Republican platform of that year "condemned," though it is probable that the complaint of the same party this year will be that the Democrats want to remonetize silver. But, leaving that question of consistency one side, it is desirable, in view of the claim of the Republicans of this State cited above, to pass in review the financial management of the present Republican Administration, especially as contrasted with the record of the Democratic Administration preceding it.

Taking up first the question of economy in public expenditures and resultant ease in the situation of the Treasury, the comparison is far from bearing out the Republican boast. During President Cleveland's term the revenues exceeded expenditures by an average of nearly $100,000,000 per year. In President Harrison's first year the excess of revenue was $85,000,000, last year it fell to $26,000,000, and this year it will be considerably less than nothing. This difference is due not to declining revenues, but to swollen expenditures. The total revenue in the first year of Republican control was $16,000,000 greater than in any year of the Democratic Administration, and was $5,000,000 greater last year. The total expenditures tell the story, having been $19,000,000 greater in Harrison's first year than in any one of Cleveland's, and no less than $66,000,000 in his second. In place of the overflowing Treasury which Secretary Fairchild left behind him, Mr. Foster can show a net cash balance at the end of April, 1892, of only $31,000,000, and nearly half of that is made up of subsidiary coin which is practically an unavailable asset. And, as is well known and he virtually admits, even that narrow surplus would have been wiped out had he not held back payment of millions of appropriations made by a Congress Republican in both its branches. On the basis of this dispassionate comparison it certainly takes a good degree of effrontery for the Republicans to go on claiming a monopoly of the talent for financial administration.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Passing to the matter of actual interference with the currency—a subject which bears most directly upon that "good faith of the nation" to which the Republicans now refer—we find the fact to be that the Democratic Administration bent all its efforts to the repeal of the Bland Bill of 1878, and was so openly hostile to any extension of the silver coinage that the free-silver question was practically lifeless during the whole of Cleveland's term. But no sooner did the Republicans come into power than they began to display their superior genius for finance by coquetting and compromising with the silver-men. They fell into the immense mistake of supposing that a few chunks of meat thrown to the pack would satisfy them, instead of simply whetting their appetite and bringing them back the next day hungrier and fiercer than ever. The vaunted act of July 14, 1890, was accepted by the silver champions merely as a payment on account, and as an augury of final success in getting their whole bill paid. Not only did it thus inflame the madness which it was intended to allay, but in itself it has proved a most embarrassing measure to the Treasury. It appears from Secretary Foster's answer to the Morgan resolutions that the Treasury is already a loser to the extent of $12,000,000 under the provisions of this brilliant stroke of Republican finance. More than that, so threatening has that law become to the business interests of the country that chambers of commerce are demanding that it be rescinded, and a leading Republican Congressman has introduced a bill for its repeal. What is this but a confession that the law was a blunder from the start, and that three years of a Republican Administration have brought the finances of the country into a more embarrassed and even critical condition than has been known since the resumption of specie payments?

The personnel of the Treasury Department furnishes another basis for a comparison of the two Administrations, no more favorable to the Republican claim than the others. If Manning was known mainly as a politician before becoming Secretary, his ability and effectiveness as a financier were immediately demonstrated in his official papers and decisions. His successor was in all respects a safe and accurate Secretary. Of Mr. Windom's high character there can be no question, yet his ability, which was great, was too often displayed as ingenuity and audacity in playing with fire. His untimely death saved him from the mortification of seeing how futile his silver measure was in restraining the frenzy of the silver-men, and how heavy a load it has become to the Treasury. It is a great falling off to come to his successor, of whom it is the simple truth to say that he was fitted by previous training to discharge only the political part of the Secretary's duties, and that he has given his strength to that part. As manager of the nation's finances he has shown a vacillation without precedent, has made estimates absurdly wide of the mark, has allowed subordinates to be guilty of the most scandalous indiscretion, and in general has followed a fatuous "after-us-the-deluge" policy. He has been the weakest financier that the Treasury has seen in years, precisely when the exigencies of the situation called for the highest talent and the firmest character.

The comparison we have made is not vitiated by the undoubted fact that the Democratic party as a whole is not so sound on finance as is the Republican party as a whole. The point is, that the Democrats did, in fact, elect a President who was sound, and who gave the country a sound and able financial administration, while the Republicans elected leaders who have plunged the national finances into serious difficulties. The comparison that business men will make is just the one that we have made—a comparison of the actual records of the last two Administrations. In face of the showing thus arrived at, for the Republicans to claim that the finances of the country are safe in their hands alone, is not only to lay themselves open to the charge of untruthfulness and hypocrisy, but, what is far more dangerous in a political campaign, is also to expose themselves to ridicule.

THE DUTY ON OLD BOOKS.

THE abominableness of a duty on literature is an old story, but the "crazy-quilt" patch-workers who evolved the McKinley Bill have succeeded in producing in this particular, as elsewhere in that bill, fresh confusion, fresh restrictions, more unreasonableness, and more injustice. The paragraph of the McKinley Act free list which allows the importation of old books reads as follows: "Books, engravings, photographs, bound or unbound etchings, maps, and charts, which shall have been printed and bound or manufactured more than twenty years at the date of importation." This badly worded clause is a good example of the results of the tinkering method of producing legislation, as will be more clearly seen if we go back to previous tariff laws to trace the evolution of it. The paragraph appeared in the Tariff Act of July 14, 1870, where it read simply, "Books which have been printed and manufactured more than twenty years," and it was repeated in the Revised Statutes (1873) as section 2505, with slightly elaborated language, as follows: "Books which shall have been printed and manufactured more than twenty years at the date of importation." Here, of course, the stipulation "printed and manufactured" applies directly to the article books, but in the Tariff Act of 1883 the wording of the clause was changed, by the insertion of the words in italics, to read: "Books, *engravings, bound or unbound, etchings, maps, and charts*, which shall have been printed and manufactured more than twenty years at the date of importation"; and here the requirement "printed and manufactured more than twenty years" would apply not only to books, but also to the new articles enumerated, and of the latter, engravings might be bound or unbound. In the McKinley Act there was a further interpolation of the word "photographs" directly after the word "engravings," and the qualifying words "bound or unbound" were pushed along, and, by the removal of the comma, were made to apply (intentionally or unintentionally) to etchings instead of to engravings; while the confusion was made complete by the addition of the words "and bound" to the clause, which must be construed to apply equally to all the articles enumerated.

The question arises as to the effect of this awkward introduction of the words "and bound" into section 512 of the free list. The Treasury Department rulings under the Revised Statutes and the Tariff Act of 1883 held that unbound printed sheets were not "books printed and manufactured" within the meaning of that clause; but doubt was thrown upon this interpretation by the opinion of the Attorney-General of September 16, 1886, to the effect that works imported in printed sheets in unbound condition were none the less books, and, if printed more than twenty years, were entitled to free entry. The words in question might, therefore, have been added to the law in order to support the Treasury Department's construction of the paragraph as requiring books to be completely manufactured, *i. e.*, printed, folded, sewed, and bound, in order to be entitled to free entry.

The question of the assessment of duty on old books newly bound or rebound had been decided by the Treasury Department in the negative on March 5, 1872, and this decision was followed as a precedent as late as March 2, 1891, when it was held to apply on the ground that section 512 of the new Tariff Law did not differ materially from section 658 of the Act of March 3, 1883. But the Board of General Appraisers thought otherwise when the question came before them in relation to the importation of a lot of old books recently rebound, and argued that the word "bound" was new matter added by the Act of October 1, 1890, to previous legislation, and that no effect could be given to this additional language unless it was found that Congress meant to embrace by it the entire condition in which books should be admitted to free entry; moreover, no provision exists for the payment of duty on the cost of rebinding. The Board held, therefore (March 16, 1891), "that books entitled to free entry must be both printed and bound more than twenty years prior to importation, and that such binding includes rebinding when the same is entire."

As no appeal was taken from this decision within the thirty days allowed by section 15 of the Administrative Customs Act for applying to the Circuit Court of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the United States for a review of any decision of the Board, it has been followed in all subsequent similar cases of importation, and has resulted in great loss to the importers of books, and most serious inconvenience and uncertainty. It is not the custom to date book-bindings, and the most expert knowledge will not enable one to be sure of the age of any piece of binding, for books bound forty or fifty years ago, if kept in cases excluding heat and dust, will look fresher than others whose bindings of but five or ten years have been exposed to the action of light, dust, and gas. How, then, is the poor appraiser to decide equitably when his blind decision as to the date of a binding, costing perhaps two or three dollars, involves the payment or non-payment of 25 per cent. duty upon as many hundred dollars, the value of the book itself? When a book-buyer orders from foreign catalogues, he cannot know whether the books, despite their dates, may not be held dutiable by our Custom-house on the ground of the fresh appearance of their bindings; and he cannot be sure how to make out his invoices for the same reason. Nobody is helped by these vexatious hindrances. Our irrational attitude towards book-importation will not bring about a change in the manner of doing business abroad, nor will a single volume the less be bound over there, or a single volume the more be bound on this side of the ocean; so that American binders will certainly not reap any benefit. The single result is to discourage the importation of old books—a result that is chiefly harmful to the intellectual advancement of our own people. Clearly, the spirit of section 512 is to allow the free importation of all literature after a lapse of twenty years, but the Board of Appraisers make a farce of it by ruling that such literature must not be embodied in unbound books, neither must it come to American scholars in books too freshly bound, but can only be encased in bindings that have the appearance of an age of twenty years or more.

RAILWAY HOURS AND SERVICE.

A MONTH ago three directors of the Cambrian Railway, one of whom was a member of Parliament, were called before the bar of the House of Commons and publicly censured for the discharge of a railway employee who had given public testimony against that company before the Parliamentary Committee on the hours of labor of railway servants. The printed reports of the conclusions of the Committee and of the testimony make up an interesting story. There had been an investigation into the question of long hours for railway men for some time past. It was shown that certain classes of railway servants were often on duty so many consecutive hours as to imperil the public safety. This investigation led to no action on the part of Parliament, because it was felt by railway managers that any interference with their authority would relax the discipline of the employees, on which so much depended. Nevertheless, the evil and danger of overwork on the part of train and signal-men, and others holding responsible positions, were conceded, the practical result being an improvement in the arrangement of details of working hours, because of the strong public opinion aroused by the testimony taken.

Of course this testimony reflected upon the management of the railways to a greater or less extent, and the directors of the companies thus maligned (as they claimed) were indignant, all the more because their own men had furnished the damaging evidence of their requirement of exhausting service. Soon the Secretary of the Railway Servants' Society notified Parliament that four men who had testified had been discharged in consequence. The Committee called all the persons concerned before it, and reported as to three of the men that good cause existed for their dismissal. These employees were such as we are familiar with in the United States—men who neglect their duties and give their real attention and time to stirring up strikes. But as to the fourth man, named Hood, the Committee found that the discharge "was mainly in consequence of charges arising out of the evidence given by him before your Committee, and was in a manner calculated to deter other railway servants from giving evidence before your Committee." This was strictly true—the real offence of Hood was in saying anything at all about the long hours worked by servants on the Cambrian Railway; but the technical offence was falsifying the pay-sheets at his station. This he did in order to shield the company, because otherwise the sheets would have disclosed that an employee under Hood had been obliged to be on duty, at least nominally, for forty-four consecutive hours. A dismissal under such circumstances was not accepted by the House of Commons; so the offending directors were called before the bar and publicly reprimanded, after a debate which threatened at first to impose a more severe penalty.

The incident is worthy of note because it shows the fairness of the House in protecting laboring men against employing corporations when unjust treatment is shown, and also because it vindicated the right of the House and the public to freedom of testimony and of discussion in matters concerning the public welfare. It should also be noted that these supplementary examinations were made by the House Committee on the appeal of the Railway Men's Trade Union, which alleged unfair treatment to four of its members.

The subject-matter of the investigations, viz., the extra hours of railway servants, is important wherever railroads are run. A cast-iron ten hours' law we certainly ought not to have: it would work confusion rather than relief; but it is nevertheless true that many accidents might be traced back to the exhaustion and lack of vigilance displayed by railway men who had been on duty too long. The proper remedy is the holding of the corporations to a strict accountability for mishaps so arising, and the education of public opinion to the wrong and danger of excessively long, continuous service where such is the rule.

This accountability to the public is strengthened in Great Britain by an excellent system of examination into all accidents by an officer of the Royal Engineers under the direction of the semi-official Board of Trade. The reports are made to Parliament for general use and are non-political. The latest of these reports is that of Maj. Marindin on the killing of a trainman last October while switching. After asserting that the accident was due to the trainman's own negligence, the report continues: "The reason is not far to seek, for it appears that Choules had at the time been upon duty for a period of no less than 22 hours 18 minutes consecutively. It is impossible to believe that a man who had been on duty for this length of time was fit to take proper care of himself or of his train. I attribute the accident to the terribly long hours for which this man had been called upon to work."

A system of impartial investigation into all accidents in the United States would do much towards finding causes and effecting cures. But political investigators are worse than useless. Take, for example, the New York Railroad Commissioners. They have just dismissed Thomas W. Spencer, who has for nine years been the expert employed in inspecting bridges and track. His successor (after July 1st) is described as "utterly incompetent" and without experience in railroad work. Of what use would his investigation of an accident be? His only qualification for the office is that he supports Hill and is a "heeler" of Railroad Commissioner Beardsley, who was himself appointed solely to help along the political aspirations of our late Governor and present Senator. Reports by such a Board, either upon accidents or hours of labor, must be valueless.

Meanwhile, railroad managers are more and more recognizing that long hours "do not pay," even in dollars and cents; but it cannot be doubted that further progress can still be made in the line of restricting to reasonable hours the work of those railway men who are immediately responsible for life and property.

THE IRISH TRAGEDY.

LONDON, April 21, 1892.

THE general election, upon which the hopes of the Irish people have for so many long years been fixed, cannot be far off. It may come upon us any day. Meanwhile, there is no likelihood that the present posture of Irish affairs will materially change. It may therefore be opportune to consider our prospects regarding that election. Hope never beat higher than before Mr. Parnell's fall; a great change was wrought by that catastrophe. All

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that has occurred since November, 1890, has more than justified sinister anticipations respecting what was likely to result from a split. But nothing has occurred to alter the conviction that a split was inevitable from the moment of the revelation of Mr. Parnell's treachery to his country, in preferring to her welfare the gratification of his guilty passion—in bartering for the devil's gains a place beside the Washingtons. Had the party endeavored permanently to stand by him through thick and thin, as it did for some days, the power of past cohesion might have held it together for a while, but sooner or later the distrust and antipathy engendered in the minds of most by the divorce proceedings would have led to disintegration. It would be as reasonable to attribute present troubles to the action of those who deposed the leader as it would be to attribute to a crew themselves the difficulties consequent upon realizing the insanity of their captain and taking from him the command. The discouragement really lies not in the number of the representatives who stand by Mr. Parnell's manes, but in the extent to which they find support in Ireland.

When the division came, many thought that Mr. Parnell could not hold out for a month. He held out, with apparently undiminished support, until his death nearly a year afterwards. From his grave sprang a feeling more bitter and irreconcilable than any that had shown itself during his lifetime. Whence the Parnellite funds come is a problem; but hitherto they appear sufficient, whether for elections, newspapers, or the sustenance of Parliamentary members. The Waterford election proved how mistaken were anticipations that Parnellism, without Mr. Parnell, would have no continued vitality. The Irish representation stands at present fifty-three Nationalists, thirty-one Parnellites, eighteen Conservatives. The forecast of the *Times* election commissioner seems to me tolerably well grounded, that there will be returned in the new Parliament (supposing there is no want of funds on one side or the other) seventy Nationalists, ten Parnellites, twenty-two Conservatives. If he errs, it is perhaps in underestimating the possible number of Conservatives. It is easy to point out that no people are ever united upon any question, and that, after all, seventy as against thirty-two would give a large majority in favor of a reasonable measure of home rule. It is easy to point out that the probably increased number of Conservatives will result, not from a diminution in the number of those who desire home rule, but in the better preparedness of those who oppose it. It is easy to point out that present differences among Nationalists are a guarantee that a homogeneous Protestant party in an Irish Parliament would be likely to hold the balance of power. But in the balancing of British opinion and in the consideration of such an important question as that of home rule, a change from a united party of eighty-four, fully prepared to make the best of whatever measure was agreed to, to one of seventy, leaving ten possibly in bitterest opposition, must seriously influence the British electorate.

Most unfortunate, too, will be the impression produced by Ulster (as appears probable) having a majority of members against home rule. No one, Irish or English, has altered his opinion who seven years ago fully gauged the necessity of the measure, both for the elevation and regeneration of Ireland and for disencumbering the Imperial Parliament. A philosophic conviction does not always prevent discouragement, at times almost amounting to hopelessness, as under recent developments. And how many held to their opinions more through sympathy, fashion, or feeling, than from deep conviction? The fact alone that English deputations are no longer sure of the enthusiastic receptions they met in Ireland from 1885 until Mr. Parnell's declarations regarding "English wolves" (indeed, no deputation since those utterances has thought it safe to make the experiment), has a most deterrent influence. Ireland is not the fashion as she was, and English social questions are pressing more and more to the front. Patriots engaged in belittling each other are by no means the objects of sympathy and interest they were when heroically enduring the amenities of Mr. Balfour's constabulary and jailers. There is less apparent hearty support of home rule among Irish Protestants than there was five years ago. Ascendancy in Ireland, for many years utterly demoralized by the shock of the land agitation, has been of late steadily reorganizing its forces; and so great is the strength of social influence, dominated by the official classes, and so remorselessly and surely has the power of boycott and ostracism been employed against persons suspected of Nationalist sympathies, that we fear it would now be difficult to procure those Irish Protestant declarations in favor of the change which were, during the Aberdeen régime, cheerfully accorded. The war of parties has been too severe a strain to be borne by thousands of tender souls. The tendency of those who nominally cease to take an interest in politics is to pass over to the Conservatives. Thousands who formerly read Nationalist papers have, from personalities and bitterness latterly shown in them, sought quiet in the columns of the Conservative press.

The apparent strength of opposition would doubtless disappear upon the establishment of home rule. For the present it seems like iron. Most Nationalists feel anxious and discouraged, especially, perhaps, those upon whom would be likely to devolve some of the burthen of the government of Ireland under a new régime. It is to be feared that a love of disaffection has become almost chronic in some sections of Irish society—as if people could not be happy unless in opposition to powers that be. Ireland is being more and more demoralized by Treasury grants, public works, loans, relief works. It is said that upon an adjustment of financial affairs between the countries, she would be the gainer. However this may be, the fact remains that there is apparently no limit to the financial concessions of John Bull, if only to silence "those beggarly Irish"; and that an Irish exchequer would soon be exhausted, and then all the socialistic and opposition forces throughout the country, expressed, it might be, at first, by only 10 per cent. of the representation, would come fully into play, demanding the realization of the golden prosperity so thoughtlessly prophesied by some as an immediate result of home rule. The present movement has found its strength partly in descending to a lower and more prosaic level than that of the Irish nationalism of former years. Nothing must now be done to diminish the expenditure of British money in Ireland. Where formerly the erection of new barracks and jails would have been held up to odium, they are now favored as leading to that expenditure of the "hard money" of which the country is so much in want. The Irish Nationalist members of both parties are, however, happily free from suspicion of desiring individual aggrandizement for themselves or their friends. The Conservative party have more and more made it a portion of their policy in all parts of the United Kingdom to minister to local needs through the dispensation of imperial grants.

The abusive language, the suspicion, the impugning of motives, the reciprocal libelling on both sides in this contest have done much to weaken public confidence. Nothing said by opponents during the darkest passages of the Pigott forgeries was much worse than what is now freely bandied between men who are believed to have known each other intimately. Other peoples can, without doubt, indulge in such amenities without danger to their liberties. Ireland cannot afford them. Few indeed are the Nationalist leaders whose prestige has not in some measure suffered. It has been too much forgotten that, bad as Parnellism is, Nationalism itself can by contest be dragged down to the same level. And yet, with the most thoughtful of those who believe they understand the combatants, the uppermost feeling is intense compassion. Knowing what the men really are, what at bottom are their desires and capacities, how unselfishly they have worked, how freely they have sacrificed, how patiently they have suffered, surely we may believe most of them are still capable of rising above present misunderstandings and complications, and again uniting for the common good. They appear now as if acting under some hideous nightmare or hallucination. The struggle of these long years (the continuation of the bitter contests of centuries) has been so severe, the sickness of hope deferred has been so real, as to have, as it were, temporarily thrown many noble natures off their balance. It was almost enough to shatter any cause to have so long to battle with such overwhelming force, to have borne such trials, and to have suffered such betrayal by a leader. Should the present movement, by any chance, end in disaster, "the classes" in Ireland will yet realize the mistake they are now making in opposing a steady *non possumus* to a movement capable of forming a basis for the orderly settlement of the country.

Bewildered as the British Liberals doubtless now are by recent developments of the struggle, they appear to me well enough inclined, with clear-sighted honesty and determination to support the convictions of their leaders. The British masses are perhaps somewhat thick-headed and difficult to move; but, once convinced, it is not their nature to go back. As the degradation wrought by slavery was, by the interested and thoughtless, used as the most powerful argument for the retention of the system, and by the clear-sighted for its destruction, so is it with the present difficulties in Ireland. No other nation in modern times has presented such a spectacle as she does in the steady decrease of her population within half-a-century, from 8,250,000 to 4,750,000, in its continuing decrease, in her constant unrest, in the patent source of weakness she is to the Empire of which she forms a part, in her inferiority to the sister island in all save natural features, the capabilities of her people, and their high morality. Present woes have been wrought under a system of external rule of a class and a religion, for a class and a religion, by a class and a religion. Sooner or later this system must end. If at the coming election, so much the better. But it now appears improbable that this change will bring immediate peace and contentment. We shall not garner in sunshine the harvest for which we have labored.

D. B.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

PROSPECTS OF THE FRENCH CABINET.

PARIS, April 25, 1892.

BOTH Chambers have adjourned for the Easter vacation, and politics are at a standstill. The moment, therefore, is a favorable one to sum up the situation, and to try and fix the real meaning and tendency of the incidents which have just taken place. Naturally enough, *the* event of the session just closed has been the fall of the Freycinet Ministry and the formation of a Cabinet by M. Loubet. Scarcely yet six weeks old, the new Ministry has already passed through a series of determined attacks, and these, by somewhat forcing the Government's hand, have made it sufficiently clear, at least to the old parliamentarian, what are the peculiar dangers to which M. Loubet and his fellow-Ministers are exposed, what line of conduct they propose to take, and what future is reserved for them.

The crisis which, at the end of February, led to the fall of the Freycinet Cabinet was in no sense the outcome of a systematic opposition supported by convincing argument, nor yet of a genuine want of harmony between the Government and the majority of the Chamber. Unhappily, in France much less will suffice to overturn the Government coach. As we have here no great political parties strongly organized, with a clearly defined programme, and led by universally recognized chiefs; as, on the contrary, Parliament is broken up into a great number of distinct groups, allied only temporarily and almost at random; as, in fine, individual interests and rivalries often enough outweigh the public good in political conflicts, a ministry will frequently come to grief over a chance debate, beaten by a chance majority which no longer exists on the morrow. It must, however, be conceded that the Freycinet Ministry, during its last days, hung but loosely together. Personal ambitions interfered to complicate the situation, whence came, first, dissensions, and afterwards strained relations among members of what ought to have been a "happy family." No wonder, therefore, that a common understanding on political questions of vital interest became almost an impossibility. Complications of all kinds were not long in following. For instance, at the moment when an important law was to have been drafted, which needed the coöperation of two ministerial departments, the heads of these two departments would no longer consent to speak to each other. More than this, M. Constans, Minister of the Interior, had, in the Chamber, come to be the butt of the most virulent criticisms—criticisms, indeed, which were directed rather against the man than the politician, but which contributed none the less to enfeeble the Government more and more.

One may grant, then, that the catastrophe was not difficult to foresee. What no one was prepared for was the way in which it came about. Nothing, perhaps, more incoherent and incongruous had ever been witnessed in parliamentary annals than the debate that preceded the final defeat. The vote of confidence asked for on the Government's religious policy, eminently simple as it was, gave rise to a series of propositions and counter propositions wherein the Ministers entangled themselves as in a maze; and when at length they got out, it was to find that they were—in a minority. The humor of the situation was that the majority should have assaulted its own ramparts. On the point at issue the Cabinet and the bulk of those who conspired against it held but one opinion. The concluding incidents of the sitting and the events of the following weeks proved conclusively that such was the case.

A crisis of this nature, lacking as it did sufficient *raison d'être*, did not give much indication as to how a new Cabinet would be formed. Many thought that the situation called for a dissolution; that the existing Parliament, by its recent conduct, had shown that it did not know its own mind; and that no future Government depending upon the same support could at any time be sure of a majority that would enable it to carry on the work of legislation. Consequently, the President and the Senate ought to use their constitutional right, dismiss the existing Chamber, and appeal to the electors. M. Carnot, however, preferred to dispense with this drastic remedy; and, after a lengthened period of hesitation, M. Loubet was brought forth from the Senate, where he had played a comparatively minor rôle. To call the Loubet Cabinet a new Ministry would be obviously incorrect. It contains far more of the old element than of the new. Most of the Freycinet Ministers keep their portfolios, including M. de Freycinet himself; and most of them hold the same offices now that they did before the change. Those who have disappeared are either the nonentities, or else those who had excited animosities that rendered their return for the time being impossible. With but this slight alteration in the fresh Cabinet's composition, it was not to be expected that any great change of policy would follow. M. Loubet's advent to power, and indeed the new Prime Minister's manifesto, might have been signed *in toto* by his predecessor and fellow-Ministers. This method of patching up a ministry, taken in conjunction with the fantastical vote mentioned above, amply exemplifies, I think, what I said at the beginning as to the manner in which French cabinets are often constituted and fall to pieces.

The first days of the newly constituted Government were marked, it will be remembered, by a number of Anarchist outrages. Attempts were made to blow up in succession some military barracks and three private houses. As may be imagined, these explosions caused a profound emotion in Paris—an emotion which foreign newspapers exaggerated into mad panic and affright. Paris was not panic-stricken, but certainly rendered uneasy; and when at first the police seemed to hesitate and to take no energetic action, recriminations made themselves heard, while some newspapers profited by the occasion to sing the praises of the "departed" Minister of the Interior, and to declare that if only M. Constans had been at the helm of affairs, his watchful activity would have prevented any such deeds from taking place. These murmurings, however, in no wise damaged the Cabinet. In general, the people thought that at such a time the executive power ought not to have its hands weakened. Further, the two Chambers, feeling that the existing law did not give adequate authority to criminal courts for dealing with dynamite offences, voted without opposition the extra demands that the Government at once came forward to make.

The Anarchist difficulty dealt with, there remained still the religious question, which, as it had already been the occasion of the late Ministry's fall, threatened equal embarrassment to the present rulers of the country. M. Loubet, in his religious policy, made it clear that he intended to maintain the attitude taken by his predecessors. It is true, he did not express this in so many words. In order to put himself on constitutional ground, he declared that he would base his action in the matter on the Concordat of 1801, which still regulates the relations of Church and State in France. At the same time he endeavored to render both sides of the Chamber favorable to his policy. Hoping to catch the support of the section to whom the clergy is a *bête noire*, and who as a body favor a policy of repression, he announced that the Government was determined sternly to repress all clerical interference in political affairs. On the other hand, as a bait for the Moderates, he insinuated that he and his colleagues sincerely desired peace and reconciliation between Church and State, and that for his part he would scrupulously observe all engagements to which the civil power had lent its sanction. Amid these ambiguities of language, fresh circumstances arose which very soon brought to light the Ministry's real preferences.

A certain number of ecclesiastics had begun during Lent to tackle the engrossing subject of Socialism, either by treatment in the ordinary sermon, or by a kind of contradictory lecture from the pulpit, during which the part of the opposition was played by a priest previously prepared with certain objections. Neither the one nor the other method pleased the Socialists. The ordinary sermon was only a one-sided argument; and the contradictory lecture, where everything had been cut-and-dried, seemed little better than a sham. Serious disorders followed. A certain number of Socialists and of the extreme Radicals went to the churches in crowds, interrupted the speakers, and, when the church authorities intervened, broke into open riot. As a rule the police refused to interfere, on the ground that their duty was confined to maintaining order in the streets. The affair had then to be fought out between the church officials and the rioters, and the upshot was that more than once the furniture and images, etc., of the buildings were wrecked. About the same time several of the bishops thought fit to hold language which might be interpreted against the Government. For instance, the Bishop of Mende prepared to publish certain instructions to old and young of his diocese, in outward form spiritual enough, but between the lines containing criticism of certain acts of the civil power. Add to this that the faithful were admonished to vote only for the "ardent Catholic," and it is not to be wondered at that the Government should seize the incriminated copies, while still in the press, in order to pursue the delinquent.

These incidents naturally came up for discussion before the Chamber. At once the Conservatives, reminding the Government of its promises, called upon the Minister of Public Worship to take measures for insuring liberty and order in the churches. The Radicals, on their side, were not behindhand in demanding to know what course the Ministry was going to follow in presence of the "underhand manœuvres of the clergy." The two questions were really quite distinct; and, this being the case, separate replies should have been given. But, instead of disentangling the two issues, the Government preferred to join them together. As a matter of fact, both in equity and in law, the claim of the Conservatives was perfectly justified. The law itself is clearly laid down. The Government is obliged in any case to see that freedom of worship is assured. If disturbances arise, its duty is to put a stop to them, and to prosecute and punish the instigators. But the Ministry feared that, by giving a pledge to the Conservatives and promising to prevent the recurrence of the disorders complained of, it would discontent the Radical party. It therefore limited itself to a few vague protestations, try-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing at the same time to attenuate what had happened and to throw the responsibility of it on the clergy. Then, attacking in its turn, it took upon its own shoulders the burden of the Radicals' complaint, condemned the attitude of divers of the clergy; declared that the Government would never tolerate criticism of its acts by bishops serving under it and figuring on the budget; and, finally, announced that it intended to prosecute the Bishop of Mende and to deprive him for a time of his stipend. These tactics had the desired success. The Republican party, always ready to repeat the famous epigram of Gambetta, "Le cléricalisme, voilà l'ennemi," accorded a vote of confidence to the Ministry with the utmost unanimity, and no more was heard of doing justice to the legitimate complaints of the Conservatives. Henceforth it was easy to understand in what sense was to be interpreted the previously vague language of the Government to both parties. The Moderates were to content themselves with fair words, while the positive pledges fell to the share of the Radicals.

If the debate on the religious policy of the Government ended in a complete victory for the Ministerialists, another which took place a few days later came very near to ending in a defeat. This time the colonial policy was in question. Though possessing a sufficiently large number of colonies and continually making efforts to extend her influence and rule over great and numerous territories, France cannot yet be said to have a colonial policy. With all due appreciation of what has been done during the last few years, it must be confessed that the efforts of our countrymen have never thus far corresponded to any general idea, nor have they ever been made on a clearly conceived plan, the realization of which might be slowly and surely pursued. The ministries that have successively come into power have always proceeded by small and isolated expeditions. Protesting always that their ambition was not great, that they simply wished to chastise a few rebels or avenge an insult to the flag, they asked at first for a small grant wherewith to send a small body of troops, and invariably finished by spending more money and losing more troops than if they had made a definite conquest once for all. Even the principle of colonial extension is far from being universally admitted. Therefore each time that a question of colonial policy is brought before the Chambers, the debates are long and animated, for not only is a point made of discussing the Government proposals, but the maintenance of certain colonies, as indeed the expansion of France itself, forms the subject of serious argument.

This was what happened on the present occasion. The Government asked for a supplementary grant, destined to reinforce the troops that were operating in the Sudan towards the "Hinterland" of the colony of Senegal, and to despatch an additional force to the coast of Guinea. The Dahomans, who had hitherto enjoyed the protectorate of France, had suddenly revolted and were menacing the French ports. Scarcely had this demand been made in the Chamber, when the Ministry was attacked on all sides, and, together with the Government debate on the grant, came the inevitable private motion and discussion on colonial policy. While some members protested against any sending of troops whatsoever for the new expedition, others proposed, on the contrary, to augment the grant asked for by the Government, on the ground that it was manifestly insufficient. These latter added that it was high time to break with the shilly-shally policy that had so far been pursued, and to resolve to act with decision and vigor. Curiously enough, it was the members of the Right—those who previously had been accustomed to protest against all colonial expeditions—who now came forward to advocate the bolder measures.

The attitude of the Government on this occasion was singularly inconsequent. Faithful to the traditions of its predecessors, it would make no definite engagement of any kind, declaring simply that it desired only the grant it had asked for, in order to meet the present necessity, and that it wished in no way to prejudge the future. One member of the Cabinet went so far as to say that he had no plan. After all said and done, the Ministry finished by obtaining what it wanted; nevertheless it was not able to congratulate itself on having gained a victory. It carried no vote of confidence, and it was by a majority of only thirty-eight that it avoided a vote of censure. If, then, the question put to the Government on its religious policy had helped to strengthen the Cabinet, that addressed to it on its colonial policy had done much to seriously undermine it.

To sum up, it may be said that the situation of the Loubet Ministry is at the present moment almost the same as that of the Freycinet Ministry at the moment of its fall—a state of things, indeed, natural enough, seeing that it represents the same policy, is composed of nearly the same elements, and is at the head of the same Chamber. It is unable to rely on a solid and uniform majority. Obliged to reckon continually with the diverse factions of the Republican majority of the Chamber, it can live only from day to day, and that without any clearly defined political line of conduct. With a little skill and complaisance it may be able, indeed, barring unforeseen accidents, to prolong its existence for several months; but it may also fall to-morrow on some trifling question, without there being any formal opposition on the part of the Chamber, and consequently without there being necessarily any change, as a result of its fall, in the total policy of the country. Outside this general statement—unsatisfactory enough—it is possible, by studying the parliamentary incidents which have characterized the Government's accession to power, to point out the dangers it is fated to encounter. Whatever may happen in the colonies, and whatever may be the success of the expeditions which are to be undertaken, the hesitating attitude it has assumed in the matter of colonial policy is sure to induce hesitations in the after settlement of the States it may be called upon to administer. On the other hand, in spite of the brief success which it has procured for itself by the recent exposition of its religious policy, it has really and permanently satisfied no one. Its fault has been a primary want of frankness, which will ultimately become a formidable weapon of indictment in the hands of the Opposition, and serious embarrassment, to say the least, will in the long run result from it.

Truth to tell, it is not from the ministerial and parliamentary standpoint alone that the religious and colonial questions have such importance. They are incontestably, though without its being always clearly understood, the two questions which at the present time outweigh all others in France. S.

FREEMAN AS AN HISTORIAN.

London, April 23, 1892.

In a preceding letter I have said something regarding the personal qualities of the distinguished writer whom England has just lost; in this one I will make a few observations on his gifts as an historian.

Every one knows the old maxim, "*Pectus facit theologum.*" Not less aptly may it be said that the merits of a great historian are far from lying wholly in his intellectual powers. One of the highest of such merits, a merit which the professional student has even more reason to appreciate than the general reader, is a moral quality—the love of truth, and the willingness to undertake, in the search for it, a toil by which no credit will ever be gained. This sort of conscientious industry was possessed by Freeman in a very high measure. Though he talked less about facts and verities than Carlyle did, Carlyle was not so assiduous and so minutely careful in sifting every statement before he admitted it into his pages. That he was never betrayed by sentiment into a sort of partisanship it would be too much to say. His Scotch critics used to accuse him of having been led by his English patriotism to over-estimate the claims of the English Crown to suzerainty over Scotland. Mr. J. R. Green and Mr. C. H. Pearson thought that the same cause disposed him to overlook the weak points in the character of Harold, son of Godwin, one of his favorite heroes. But there have been very few writers who have so seldom erred in this way; few who have striven so earnestly to do full justice to every cause and every person. The characters he has drawn of Lucius Cornelius Sulla, William the Conqueror, and Thomas of Canterbury are models of the fairness which historical portraiture requires. Though disposed to be positive in his opinions, he was always willing to reconsider a point when any new evidence was discovered or any new argument brought to his notice, and not unfrequently modified his view in the light of such evidence or arguments. It was this passion for accuracy and for that lucidity of statement which is the necessary adjunct of real accuracy, that made him deal so sternly with confused thinkers and careless writers. Carelessness seemed to him, as indeed it ought to be regarded, a moral fault, because a fault which true conscientiousness excludes. So also clearness of conception and exact precision in the use of words were so natural to him, and appeared so essential to good work, that he was apt to set down the want of them rather to indolence than to incapacity, and to apply to them a proportionately severe censure. Never touching any subject which he had not mastered, he thought it his duty as a critic to expose pretenders, and rendered in this way, during the years when he wrote for the *Saturday Review*, services to English scholarship second only to those which were embodied in his own treatises.

The habits of accuracy which he had formed were well illustrated by his attitude towards branches of history he had not explored. With a profound and minute knowledge of English history down to the time of King Edward the Second, a less full but very sound knowledge down to Elizabeth, and with a thorough knowledge of pretty nearly all ancient history, and of foreign mediæval history till about the time of Charles the Fifth, his familiarity with modern European history since the sixteenth century, and with the history of such outlying regions as India or the United States, was only that of the average well-educated man. But when he had occasion to refer to those periods or countries, he hardly ever made a mistake. If he did not know, he did not refer; if he referred, he had seized, as if by instinct, some-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

thing which was really important and serviceable for his purpose. The same remark applied to Gibbon and to Macaulay. I am not sure that it holds equally good of Mommsen, admirably exact as he is in his own wide dominions.

Industry came naturally to Freeman, because he was so fond of his own study. None of his work was task work; all was done because he loved doing it. This joy in reading and writing of the past came from the intensity with which he realized it. In some directions he did not show much imagination: he had, for instance, no pleasure in books of travel and very little in poetry. But he loved to dwell in the past, and seemed to see and feel and make himself a part of the events he described. Next to their worth as statements of carefully investigated facts, the chief merit of his books lies in the sense of reality which fills them. The politics of Syracuse, the contest of William the Red with St. Anselm, interested him as keenly as a general election in which he was himself a candidate. Looking upon all current events with an historian's eye, he was fond of illustrating features of Roman history from incidents he had witnessed in taking part in local government as a magistrate, and has, in his account of the relations of Hermocrates and Athenagoras at Syracuse, some reflections suggested by his experience as a member of the Hebdomadal Council at Oxford. This power of realizing the politics of ancient or mediæval times was especially useful to him as a writer, because without it his books might have run the risk of being dull, seeing that he cared exclusively for the political part of history and scarcely ever touched upon social or religious phenomena—subjects from which such writers as his friend and disciple J. R. Green drew much of what gives a charm to their narratives. This was one of the points in which he rose superior to most of those German students with whom it is natural to compare him. Many of them have equalled him in industry and diligence; some have perhaps even surpassed him in the ingenuity which they bring to bear upon obscure problems; but very few of them have the same gift for understanding what the political life of remote times really was like. Like Gibbon, Freeman was not a mere student, but also a man of affairs, accustomed to take a part in the world's work, which enabled him to know how things happen in a way which the mere student seldom can. If he had less ingenuity than some of the Germans, he had far more common sense, and brought it to bear about their conjectures in a thoroughly useful and practical way. And he was wholly free from that craving which seems to possess so many of them to have at all hazards something new to advance, be it a trivial fact or an unsupported guess. He was accustomed of late years to complain that German scholarship seemed to be suffering from the passion for "Etwas Neues," and the disposition to disparage work which did not abound with novelties, however empty and transient such novelties might be.

The mention of the Germans suggests a reference to the enormous quantity of work he produced. Besides the five thick volumes devoted to the Norman Conquest and William Rufus, the three thick volumes to Sicily, four large volumes of collected essays, and nine or ten smaller volumes on architectural subjects, on the English Constitution, on the United States, on the Slavs and the Turks, he wrote an even greater quantity of matter which appeared in the *Saturday Review* for the twenty years from 1856 to 1876. This immense facility of production was due to his power of concentration. He always knew what he meant an article to contain before he sat down to his desk; and in his historical researches he made each step so certain that he seldom required to reinvestigate a point or to change, in revising for the press, the substance of what he had said. He was by no means what would be called a man of business—leaving the management of his property, for instance, chiefly to those nearest to him; but in his literary habits he was singularly methodical and precise. It is often observed that the extent to which all who write are drawn into journalism, and forced to write quickly, hastily, and profusely, must tend to injure literature both in matter and in manner. In point of matter, Freeman, though for the best part of his life a very prolific journalist, writing two long articles a week during twenty years, did not seem to suffer. He was as exact, clear, and thorough at the end as he had been at the beginning. On his style, however, the results were not wholly fortunate. It retained its force and its point, but it became diffuse—not that each given sentence was weak, or vague, or wordy, but that what was substantially the same idea was too apt to be reiterated, with slight differences of phrase, in several successive sentences. This tendency to repetition caused some of his books, and particularly the Norman Conquest and William Rufus, to swell to dimensions unfavorable to their popularity. That work would certainly be more widely read if it had been, as with more effort at compression it might have been, reduced from seven volumes to four. For this reason his manner is perhaps at its best in some of the smaller books, such as the sketches of towns and the collected essays. It must, however, be added that the prolixity we sometimes regret was partly due to his anxiety to be scrupulously accurate; and that the tendency to repeat the same word too frequently was due to his preference for words of Teutonic origin. He prided himself on this purity of English; but some of his friends thought he sacrificed too much to it. Nor must one forget to express a regret that he did not more frequently enliven his pages by indulging in the humor so natural to him. His letters sparkled with wit and fun, but it is only in the notes to his histories, and seldom even there, that he allows one of the most characteristic features of his mind to appear.

So far I have spoken only of his books. He was, however, also a Regius professor of history during the last ten years of his life, and the head of the historical faculty in his own University, which he loved so dearly. That he was less brilliant as a teacher than as a writer may be partly ascribed to his having come too late to a new kind of work, and one which eminently demands the freshness of comparative youth; partly also to the cramping conditions under which history has to be taught at Oxford, where everything is governed by a system of competitive examinations which Freeman was never tired of denouncing as ruinous to true study. His friends were, however, inclined to doubt whether the natural bent of his mind was towards oral teaching. It was a very peculiar mind, which ran in a deep channel of its own, and could not easily, if the metaphor be permissible, be drawn off to irrigate the adjoining fields. He was always better at putting his own views in a clear and telling way than at laying his intellect alongside of yours, apprehending your point of view, and setting himself to meet it. Or, to put the same thing differently, you learned more by listening to him than by conversing with him. He had not the sort of quick intellectual sympathy and effusion which feels its way to the heart of an audience, and indeed derives inspiration from the sight of an audience. Oddly enough, each of his three distinguished predecessors in the chair of Modern History at Oxford has been, though not for quite the same reasons, far more eminent as a writer than as a teacher. Each of them, and especially Mr. Goldwin Smith and Dr. Stubbs, adorned the post and stimulated historical study by his mere presence in Oxford, accessible to students and influencing the intellectual movements of the place. So Freeman's residence there, where he delighted to surround himself with all the ablest and most studious of the young workers, and his giving to them the fullest measure of encouragement and generous recognition, and setting a splendid example of loyalty to truth and love of freedom, conferred on the University a benefit the loss of which is being more than ever felt now that a cynical Prime Minister has appointed as his successor a brilliant literary man, Mr. J. A. Froude, from whom loyalty to historical truth and the love of freedom are conspicuously absent. In this way his value to Oxford can hardly be overrated. But it is after all by his books that he will be known. Some of them have already done their work in influencing the opinion or enlarging the views of his contemporaries. But others will live into a yet distant future, because the patient and thorough work and the vigorous sense which have been put into them will not permit them to be superseded, but will make them as essential to the next generation or two of students as they are now to ourselves. O. D.

Correspondence.

A MANUSCRIPT OF PRESIDENT LINCOLN.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: Mrs. Helen Clark of Millfield, near Street, Somersetshire, has a brief but very interesting manuscript of President Lincoln, which I have not seen in print. It is a preamble and resolution suggested by the President for adoption by meetings in England, and transmitted to John Bright (Mrs. Clark's father) by the Hon. Charles Sumner. The Senator's letter, enclosing President Lincoln's manuscript, is dated April 17, 1863. In it he says:

"Two days ago the President sent for me to come to him at once. When I arrived he said that he had been thinking of a matter on which we had often spoken—the way in which English opinion should be directed; and that he had drawn up a resolution embodying the ideas which he should hope to see adopted by public meetings in England.

"I enclose the resolution, in his autograph, as he gave it to me. He thought it might serve to suggest the point which he regarded as important."

PRESIDENT LINCOLN'S MANUSCRIPT.

"Whereas, While *heretofore* States and Nations have tolerated slavery, *recently*, for the first [*sic*] in the world, an attempt has been made to construct a new Nation, upon the basis of, and with the primary and fundamental object to maintain, enlarge, and perpetuate human slavery; therefore,

"Resolved, That no such embryo State should ever be recognized by, or admitted into, the family of Christian and civilised nations, and that all Christian and civilised men everywhere should, by all lawful means, resist to the utmost such recognition or admission."

The above manuscript, and Charles Sumner's letter, are kept in a frame on the wall at Millfield. Moncure D. Conway.

New York, May 2, 1892.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HARRISON AND GRANT.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: The editor of the *Nation* (April 21) writes as follows:

"It seems to be one of the peculiarities of President Harrison that he has no further use for a faithful friend who allows himself to be caught and exposed. He dropped Dudley after . . . and dropped Quay after . . . Now he is preparing to drop Wanamaker."

The above reminds one of the fable of the Wolf and the Lamb. The said editor used to ridicule President Grant for standing by his friends who happened to come "under fire"; now he blames Harrison for taking the opposite course of "dropping" his friends under like circumstance. Some people are never satisfied!

Strict Constructionist.

Prairie du Chien, May 1, 1892.

[Our "Constructionist" is not so "strict" as he imagines. We in nowise reprobated President Harrison's course in dropping the unscrupulous henchmen to whom he owed his election by bribery and corruption. Nor is Wanamaker the "friend" of Harrison in any sense but that of being, as we said in the article quoted from, "the first man [in the history of our Government] who was known to have bought his portfolio with cash." The "friends" of Grant, on the other hand, whom he stood by under fire were social acquaintances, boon companions, members of his official family, and the like, to whom he owed nothing, but who owed everything to him, and who shamefully abused his trust in them by making their relations to him a vantage ground for public plunder and a shield against detection and punishment.—Ed. Nation.]

DRED SCOTT'S BACKER.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: A correspondent, in the *Nation* of April 28, calls up the Dred Scott case, and inquires who furnished the means of bringing forward and maintaining that case of dread. The case was instituted in the United States Circuit Court for Missouri. To the declaration there was a demurrer, which was overruled, and the defendant, John F. A. Sandford of New York, was required to plead over, and on his pleas trial was had, and verdict and judgment for him. The plaintiff, by writ of error, removed the case into the Supreme Court of the United States.

As stated, the slave Dred and his wife were held in Missouri. Dred had been carried to Rock Island, Ill., and thence to Ft. Snelling, where he was married. He claimed that this carrying him by his owner into territory where slavery was prohibited made him free. The Court, six concurring, held (1) that, being of African descent, Dred could not become a citizen, even if free, and therefore could not maintain a suit in the United States courts; (2) that he could not become free by being carried into territory where slavery had been prohibited only by act of Congress, because Congress had no power under the Constitution to prohibit slavery in the territory of the United States.

Montgomery Blair was at the time a resident of St. Louis, a distinguished lawyer of that bar; afterwards a resident of Washington and Mr. Lincoln's Postmaster-General. I had more than one conversation with him about this case, which he instituted and carried through for Dred. I always understood that he advanced means to carry it forward. It was like him to have done so; and such things have several times been done by lawyers within my personal knowledge. A. G. R.

Washington, May 6, 1892.

NON-NATURALIZED CITIZENS.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: I have read with much interest your article upon "New England's Dumb Vote." As one of the "British immigrants" who "have obstinately clung to their old nationality," I should be much obliged if you would allow me to bring forward the reason which has in my own case, and I do not doubt in that of many of my countrymen, been the chief obstacle to the "assumption of the duties of citizenship." This is, the renunciation clause in the oath of allegiance. There may be some difference of opinion as to the meaning of the word *allegiance*, but to my mind it covers every duty which a patriotic man undertakes for his country to secure her honor and safety. To renounce this duty would, with many of us, be simple perjury. It lies in our bones and cannot be sworn away even if we would.

It may, of course, be claimed that one cannot truly carry out one's duty towards both the land of birth and that of adoption. This I most emphatically deny. The most trustworthy citizen is certainly not he who can, immediately on landing here, renounce all bonds that tie him to his native country.

Does a woman, for fear of future quarrels with her mother-in-law, call upon the man she marries to renounce all duty towards his mother before he vows to be true to herself? Would he comply with such a request if she made it? Would he be worth having if he did?

Do not complain of us who are debarred from the franchise by your own decree. Think of us rather as those who, with the desire and capacity to become good citizens, have not the right to take a hand in the management of even the districts in which we live. In your hands lies the remedy, not ours.

Yours truly, P. Shepherd.

Washington, D. C., May 4, 1892.

PUBLIC FINANCE.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: The annual English budget has been laid before Parliament, and, at the risk of exciting a howl of patriotic indignation, I will venture to give expression to the admiration it excites.

The first thing is its simplicity. Instead of long columns of figures which no outsider can understand, and which only obscure the totals, the summing up is as concise as that of a lady's pocket money after a day's shopping:

Revenue	£90,995,000
Expenditure	89,928,000
Surplus	£1,067,000

The estimate of a year ago gave a surplus of £166,000, so that the variation in actual results is less than 1 per cent. of the revenue. The estimates for the year 1892–'93 are:

Revenue	£90,477,000
Expenditure	90,253,000
Surplus	£224,000

—less than ¼ of 1 per cent. of the estimated revenue.

Compare this with the finance which one year has a surplus of one hundred millions and the next year is in arrear in the pay of workmen. And this year is only a sample of a history. About 1840, with a tangle of some 1,200 customs duties, the revenue showed a deficit. When the income tax was resorted to, and, in spite of the relief of several large items of taxation, showed a surplus of revenue, instead of a mad rush to pay off the debt as fast as possible, that surplus was used for further relief from taxation, binding the people together by fresh ties of loyalty and gratitude. It is perhaps not too much to say that by postponing the payment of its debt, the British nation has saved the full equivalent of the amount in its reduced proportion to the national wealth; and yet there has been going on a steady liquidation, till the amount of the debt has been reduced from £885,000,000 in 1816 to £685,000,000 at the present time. What nation in Europe can point to such a record?

Again, while nearly all the nations of the world seem to be engaged in a frantic emulation as to which, under the euphemism of "protection," shall injure its own people most in the hope of injuring foreigners, Great Britain alone stands upon her basis of free trade as on a rock, and every proposal to depart from it is met with a shout of laughter.

Why is it that the English national finance is beyond question the first in the world? Certainly it is not because of the superior wisdom of Englishmen. For one, I believe that the average of financial knowledge and of general intelligence in our Congress is fully equal to that of the British House of Commons. Nor is it that Englishmen are better financiers. We have an abundance of men as able to deal with the intricacies of finance as any Englishman who ever stepped. For example, there is compressed into four pages of the May *Forum*, and signed Michael D. Harter, a statement of the evils of our silver coinage and of the course which ought to be pursued, of which for sound finance and manly courage no English Chancellor of the Exchequer would need to be ashamed. But Mr. Harter is only one of 325 members of Congress, each of whom has as good a right as himself or anybody else to a voice in the matter. The real success of English finance lies in the fact that it is placed in the hands of one man. Parliament never proposes an expenditure or a tax. It has simply a veto upon the proposals of the Chancellor of the Exchequer. Yet it does not follow that he has it all his own way. He is exposed to an ordeal of criticism so severe that only a man of the highest abilities and (still more) purity of purpose can stand it. It is this process which has produced a list of names like those of Sir Robert Peel, Mr. Gladstone, and Mr. Goschen.

It must be confessed that for the present we are limited to merely speculative inquiry. Imagine the outcry in Congress which would meet a proposal not merely to give to the Secretary of the Treasury a seat in Congress, but to clothe him with the functions of the Committees both of Ways and Means and of Appropriations. Yet that is only a concrete statement of the much larger question whether this Government is to be carried on in the interest of the nation, or of the private interests which largely make members of Congress and control them after they are made: a question which, unless some peaceful solution in the former direction can be found, will ultimately bring on an appeal to arms. G. B.

Boston, May 5, 1892.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Notes.

HARPER & BROTHERS have under way 'Stories and Interludes,' by Barry Pain; 'An Edelweiss of the Sierras,' by Mrs. Burton Harrison; a 'Life of the Earl of Derby,' by George Saintsbury; and George William Curtis's address on Lowell before the Brooklyn Institute, illustrated with several portraits.

D. Appleton & Co. will publish immediately 'The Last Words of Thomas Carlyle,' containing his "Excursion (Futile Enough) to Paris," and his solitary novel, "Wotton Reinfred." The book will be the first of Carlyle's to receive an American copyright.

Lee & Shepard will have ready during the present month 'The Spirit of the New Education,' by Mrs. Louisa Parsons Hopkins; and 'Talks on Graphology: the Art of Knowing Character through Handwriting.'

The thirtieth volume of the 'Dictionary of National Biography' (Macmillan) is exceptionally rich in good reading, as may be judged from the fact that it embraces Dr. Johnson, Inigo Jones, Ben Jonson, Joule, the Keans, the Kembles, and Keats. Dr. Johnson has fallen to Leslie Stephen, and is admirably chronicled in sixteen compact pages. One of the great lexicographer's "emphysematous lungs," we are told, is shown in a plate in Baillie's 'Morbid Anatomy.' The American contingent is also larger than usual, and includes John Paul Jones; John Josselyn, author of 'New England's Rarities'; Edward Johnson, author of the 'Wonder-Working Providence'; Isaac (husband of Arbella) Johnson, who came over with Winthrop; Sir Wm. Johnson, who comforted himself with German, Dutch, and Indian wives or mistresses; and George Keith, who, while still a Quaker and in Pennsylvania, put forth the earliest protest of his sect against slavery (October 13, 1693). We might also instance the actress, Avonia Jones, daughter of the once barratrous George, Count Joannes; and George Johnstone, in the notice of whom is to be remarked a reference to Mr. Stevens's 'Facsimiles of MSS. relating to America.'

The eighth volume of the new 'Chambers's Encyclopædia' extends from Peasant to Rumelia. It has hardly any feature that distinguishes it from the preceding volumes, and but one that invites comment, viz., the copyrighted article on Protection, by W. Draper Lewis. The editor has surrendered this topic entirely to its American friends, perhaps from the mistaken notion that he will thus recommend his work to the American public at large. A certain timeliness attaches to this infantile argument for shoddy and against free wool: "The protectionist believes that Government can aid in the unconscious adaptation of the individual citizen to his environment. . . . The climate of England is much damper than that of the United States. Wet cotton fibre is a better conductor of heat than wet woollen fibre. . . . Cotton being more easily obtained than wool, it is a waste of energy to use the latter where the former can be employed without danger to health. The dry climate of the greater part of the United States renders it possible for the people to employ with safety a larger proportion of cotton in their clothing than is advisable in England. . . . Thus the tariff on wool and woollens, besides being defended on the ground of the protection it affords to the sheep-raisers, is also," etc., etc. Not all the articles in the present volume have been intrusted to such powerful minds as Mr. Lewis's. Mr. Clements Markham, Mr. A. H. Keane, Prof. Andrew Seth, Mr. Edmund Gosse, Mr. Holman Hunt, Mr. Hamerton, Mr. Walter Besant, Mr. Austin Dobson, and Canon Taylor, are, however, if intellectually inferior to Mr. Lewis, safer guides. This volume has the usual colored maps of the States of the Union and of other countries.

Dr. J. B. Hague's rhymed translation of the 'Odes and Epodes of Horace' (G. P. Putnam's Sons) represents, on his part, the loving work of many years. It is accompanied by the Latin text as it was received thirty or forty years ago, and by an introduction and notes intended for the general reader. The versions, although very free, contain the same number of lines as the originals; the notes consist chiefly of those views of Horace, his works, and the history of his times which formerly met with general acceptance.

A new translation of the entertaining 'Memoirs of Marguerite de Valois, Queen of Navarre,' has been brought out (London: Nimmo; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons). Henry IV.'s Queen is famous in literature and romance. Both her literary merits and her romantic adventures may be enjoyed by English readers in this excellent translation by Mrs. Singleton (Violet Fane), who has caught the spirit of the original and rendered it successfully, barring some few misapprehensions here and there. The picture of the times given by a princess whose charms were celebrated, whose rank brought her into contact with all the leading men and women of a most stirring epoch, is a brilliant one. Marguerite writes well almost always—remarkably well at times. Her native talent was helped by the scenes she witnessed and reported. The troublous years of the close of the dynasty of Valois live in her pages; the pitiable Charles IX., the contemptible Henry III., the bold Henry of Navarre, the intriguing Catherine de Médicis, are portraits touched with a master hand. As for the description of the massacre of St. Bartholomew—of so much of it, at least, as the Queen saw—it is so well known to every student of sixteenth-century history and literature that it needs only a bare mention. For the rest, Court gossip mingles with historical material; pictures of state ceremonies with accounts of family jars; political disquisitions with indignant refutations of slanders. In short, the Memoirs are full of the savor, the piquancy, the quaintness and interest of the stirring age when Huguenot strove against Catholic, and the three Henrys were in the field against each other. The work is beautifully printed on thick paper, and illustrated with excellent portraits of the chief personages.

The Clarendon Press sends out a carefully prepared edition of the old French poem contained in MS. 596, in the Lambeth Library. Mr. G. H. Orpen is the editor, and he not only has collated the text of Francisque Michel's edition of 1837 with the original MS., but has added a literal translation, abundant and well-digested notes, a map of that part of Ireland, Midhe and Laighin, in which lay the scene of the war described in the poem, full indexes of places and names, a glossary, and a title, 'The Song of Dermot and the Earl.' The MS. has been consulted by historians of Ireland, notably by Stokes, but the text has never yet been presented in so useful and handy a form as in Mr. Orpen's valuable edition. The translation, which is printed on the right-hand pages, the text occupying the left, claims no merit of literary beauty, but it has the far more important one, in this case, of faithfulness and accuracy.

Every mathematician who proposes to carry his studies beyond the college curriculum will be glad to learn that Prof. F. N. Cole has published a translation of Netto's well-known 'Theory of Substitutions,' which can be obtained by enclosing three dollars to the Register Publishing Company, Ann Arbor, Mich. If not a great classic, it is a standard treatise; and the student who is not thoroughly familiar with its contents (which can nowhere else be so conveniently mastered) will find himself put to serious inconvenience in reading many a recent German memoir. The present edition has been extensively revised and altered by the author, so that it is better than the German original—not to speak of the comfort of reading mathematics in our clear and concise language.

We may also call attention to the second edition of Joseph Edwards' 'Elementary Treatise on the Differential Calculus' (Macmillan), a sensible and useful treatise, including everything necessary, and excluding subtilties not called for. The examples are specially copious and well chosen, and in general the treatise has the best qualities of the English text-books, without their worst defects. Still, we cannot help thinking that the examination of such Continental treatises as those of Schlömilch and of Jordan would have led to some improvements. However, the student will find the presentation easy, interesting, and tolerably full.

M. Max Leclerc has reprinted in handy form from the *Revue Bleue* his address to pupils and alumni of the École Libre des Sciences Politiques on University Extension ('Le Rôle Social des Universités.' Paris: Armand Colin & Cie.). It is a clear presentation of the English movement of which America is now just feeling the contagion. M. Leclerc does not advocate a servile imitation of methods, but would have his countrymen catch the spirit of this effort to make the university a centre for the diffusion of sweetness and light in the community at large.

The choice for a thesis of such a subject as 'The Palatal Consonants in English,' by Mr. Benjamin Duryea Woodward of Columbia, is noteworthy as indicating a commendable turning to more critical work in English philology. Unfortunately, however, the thesis itself can hardly receive the highest praise. Mr. Woodward has brought together all the examples of words in which palatal consonants occur, but he seems to be too poorly equipped on the side of phonetics to carry on such an investigation successfully. A greater blunder was to base everything upon the etymologies in Skeat's Dictionary, many of which are inaccurate and have been already corrected by Kluge, whose 'Etymologisches Wörterbuch' is not mentioned by the writer. Take, for instance, the words with initial *sh* and those with the *sk* sound. The majority of the former are derived from Old English words with initial *sc*, while the majority of the latter come from the Old French or the Scandinavian. Exceptions to rules of such uniformity ought to be explained, but Skeat makes no attempt to explain them, and Mr. Woodward follows him in this.

A commendable 'Catalogue, with Descriptive Notices, of the Portraits, Busts, etc., belonging to Yale University,' has just been published by the Corporation, under the painstaking editorship of Mr. Franklin B. Dexter. The Trumbull portraits (including a full-length, life-size Washington) and miniatures cut a large figure in the collection, and the Trumbull family itself is well pictured. The list embraces a great number of colonial worthies, as well as of the leading men of the Revolution and the first half-century of the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Republic, along with latter-day governors, professors, benefactors, etc., and some Old World personages, mostly of doubtful ascription and authenticity, as Mr. Dexter intimates. One of the most interesting portraits is that of Eli Whitney by S. F. B. Morse. Mr. Dexter provides an index of artists, and one would have expected also a list of subjects, by no means rendered superfluous by the alphabetical arrangement of the descriptive notices.

The significance of the recent action of the Yale Faculty in admitting women to the degree of Ph.D. is defined by Prof. Hadley in the *Educational Review* for May. It was, he says, merely giving "official recognition as members of the University" to women, who had for many years past availed themselves, by the courtesy of instructors, of the courses of graduate instruction. Such recognition "seemed only fair," and hence was voted almost unanimously. Prof. Hadley argues that this step does not involve co-education in the College, which has been conservative, while the University existing side by side with it has been progressive, and makes in this instance no breach of tradition.

An appeal for the equipment of the Soldiers' Field, Harvard's new athletic ground beside the Charles River, has been put forth by a committee with Mr. Alexander Agassiz at its head, and Mr. William Hooper, No. 87 Milk Street, Boston, for its treasurer. Plans accompany the statement of needs, and call for the sum of fifty thousand dollars.

The "Quarter-yearly Review of the Liberal Arts called the *Knight Errant*," which emanates from Boston (Elzevir Press, 106 Pearl Street), has a well-devised cover design, and indulges in bold print on heavy paper with generous margins. The typography, viewed narrowly, is not first-rate. The articles are, mostly, vague echoes of Ruskin, Rossetti, and William Morris, and can hardly pass for bugle notes in the "war against the Paynims of realism in art, . . . the dragon of materialism, and the fierce dragon of mammonism," "for the succour of forlorn hopes and the restoration of forgotten ideals." The poetry of the number is equally ineffective. It would be hard to characterize the mélange, which includes part of an address by Prof. Norton, an allegory by Brander Matthews, a tale or picture by Bliss Carmen. In the main, the *Knight Errant* would seem to be not "a magazine of appreciation," but of depreciation. The one incontestable document is a photogravure of the lovely "Columbine" of Bernardino Luini.

One of the most beautiful maps ever issued by the house of Dietrich Reimer, Berlin, is the second edition of the "Carte Générale des Provinces Européennes et Asiatiques de l'Empire Ottoman" of Dr. Henry Kiepert. It might not inaptly be styled a map of the Eastern question. Its sweep is from the meridian of Rome to that of Shiraz, and from the parallel of Munich, Vienna, Kharkov, to that of Cairo and Suez. Within these limits, Arabia alone, of the members of the Ottoman Empire, is neglected. The whole of Hungary, Austria, Greece, the major part of Italy, are shown; the whole of the Black and Caspian Seas. The scale, 1:3,000,000, is sufficiently large to make of the four sheets conjoined a serviceable wall-map. They come to us conveniently folded as a folio, with tapes for hanging, and accompanied by an alphabetic index of places in octavo. The lettering is very clear and the coloring delicate.

Leach, Shewell & Sanborn send us the tenth edition of Dr. Kiepert's Ancient Atlas in twelve maps, and this, too, is provided with an index.

The death of Mr. Roswell Smith will cause no practical change in the policy or management of the Century Company. His place as President will be taken by Mr. Frank H. Scott, who has been connected with the company from the start, and has hitherto acted as Treasurer.

The reputation which the Bodleian Library enjoys for its collection of Cotton Mather's works has recently been put in peril by one of the subordinates of that famous institution, who stole these books. They were valued at £80. It is satisfactory, however, to learn that the whole of the Mather tracts have been recovered. The offender was sent to prison for a month with hard labor. Who tempted him?

"W. M. G." writes to us: "Permit me to call your attention to the fact that the identification of Mérimée's 'Inconnue' with 'Jennie Dacquin' is not a *new* discovery, as you will find by consulting the *Athenæum* of January 23, 1874. 'Dacquin' does not look French, and does look like a Frenchman's attempt to spell an English name which he has only heard, not seen. Sixteen years ago, it seems, the lady's name was spelled 'Jenny Dakin.'"

The article on the present requirements for admission to Harvard College in the current *Atlantic* is from the pen of Mr. James J. Greenough, and not (as we were led into saying) by his father, Prof. Greenough.

—We do not know whether any other class at Harvard has passed in its effects, but this has happened in the case of the class of 1828, owing to the death of its secretary, the late Dr. Henry I. Bowditch, and the near extinction of the class, there being but six survivors. The most famous of these is Mr. Robert C. Winthrop; but the Rev. Charles F. Barnard, Thomas B. Fox, George S. Hillard, and Francis George Shaw were also men of usefulness and distinction, and there were, as in every class, men of promise who were cut off in their prime, such as Charles Chauncey Emerson, the brother of the poet. A brief biography of the members, with a bibliography, is given in No. 46 of the Bibliographical Contributions of the Library of Harvard University. Dr. Bowditch was his own bibliographer, in no vain sense, and his notes on the several pieces in his list are perfectly characteristic of this warm-hearted and delightful man. His abolition attitude and activity, as in the Garrison mob, the Latimer case, the "Anti-Man-Hunting League" of Fugitive-Slave Law times, the war of the rebellion, are indicated with joyful recollection. The plan of the League was "to run off the slave-agent in case he declined to give up his victim after we had made reasonable propositions to him to that effect." By a regular drill "we learned how to speedily lay a man down and to carry him, in spite of his utmost efforts, out of the room without injuring him," after which he was, not lynched, in Southern fashion, but "concealed at one of our country lodges" till the fugitive was set free. "We had 24 lodges in as many towns, and 469 members," oath bound. The memorials of this organization are preserved. Also noteworthy is correspondence in manuscript concerning the inquiry, "Did Ralph Waldo Emerson sympathize with the Abolitionists?"—Dr. Bowditch holding that he never cared for them, and "was not with us in hard times." In short, these archives of a physician must not be overlooked by the historian of the anti-slavery struggle. At the close of the long list of Mr. Winthrop's writings, we are told that a patriotic hymn written by him and printed anonymously during the civil war obtained a wide circulation, and that it was not a solitary effort in verse on his part.

—The appearance of a new and extensively revised edition of Max Müller's 'Lectures on the Science of Language' has reawakened Prof. W. D. Whitney's old-time interest in that book. This interest expresses itself now in a distinct publication, a pamphlet of seventy-nine pages, entitled 'Max Müller and the Science of Language: A Criticism.' That it has been rightly named a criticism, we think the reader will be convinced. It might, however, be also called an investigation—an investigation into the scientific progress of Prof. Müller during the past thirty years. Of the first edition, representing lectures delivered in 1861 and 1863, Prof. Whitney gave a spirited account in the *North American Review* for April, 1865. His estimate of the advance made by the present edition is frankly summarized in the pamphlet before us (p. 3):

"As to these questions [the great questions which underlie the study], our author's views seem to remain what they were thirty years ago; he has gained no new light upon them from the criticisms that have been made upon his work, nor from studying the discordant views of others, nor from his own review and comparison and coördination of his old opinions. . . . It might seem as if, having written with such popular effusion and miscellaneousness about so many matters bearing upon language, he would have gladly seized the opportunity of a final revision to ponder and recombine it all, establishing in his own mind a certain connected and clearly held body of opinions which should yield one another mutual support. . . . Of course it was for him to decide what he would and what he would not undertake to do; it is not for his readers to prescribe the scope and limits of his task. But it is ours, now that the work is done, to criticise it."

The critic proceeds hereupon to apply his tests upon the author's attitude to fundamental questions; *e. g.*, the relation of thought and language, origin of language, the study of language a physical or an historical science, the individual's power over language, language as a barrier between man and the brutes, the relation of dialects to languages, the nature of phonetic change and phonetic law, etc.

—The result of our critic's patient and, on the whole, candid inquiry will be, we think, for every one who follows it the conviction that Prof. Müller has not and never did have any clear or self-consistent views whatsoever upon any of these questions. The most charitable judgment of Müller's work can only adopt the statement of Whitney (p. 75): "The book is not science, but literature. Taken as literature, it is of high rank, as the admiration of the public sufficiently testifies; its author has a special gift for interesting statement and illustration, for lending a charm to the subjects he discusses; and he carries captive the judgment of his hearers and many of his readers." We cannot refrain from noticing that the *Nation*, by a note of July 16, 1891, giving in general the same estimate of this new edition, has delivered itself from the reproof of Whitney's opening sentence, which announces the appearance of the book "followed by the usual array of commendatory notices." Whitney's pamphlet can certainly be recommended as good reading; it is incisive, clear, and sometimes sharp, and is everywhere marked by that priceless good sense which characterizes all the products of his pen.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

—On May 5, with public ceremony and official courtesy, the Trustees of the University of Pennsylvania formally declared its graduate department open to women. The exercises were conducted in the large Library Hall, which was filled with men and women interested in the higher education of that sex. The Dean of Bryn Mawr College, herself a Ph.D. of the University of Zurich, delivered the chief address, and Dr. McAllister, President of the Drexel Institute, urged less niggardly public support of girls' preparatory schools in a country where nearly 90 per cent. of the school-teachers are women; but the interest of the occasion centred around Provost Pepper's remarks. College women and their friends were assured "that co-education may be safely and effectually conducted," but that as each institution must be guided by its own organization, the Trustees of the University of Pennsylvania considered it inexpedient to admit women except to its post-graduate courses leading to the degree of Ph.D., for while undergraduate instruction can be procured at many places, "the facilities for advanced work are only adequately developed in a few great universities." Experience proves that this advanced work must be endowed even more fully than undergraduate work. When, therefore, women wished to share this instruction, special funds were required. In 1890 Col. Bennett offered the University two houses adjoining its property, to be used as a hall of residence for women graduate students. The Trustees accepted this gift of about $30,000, arranged for the Graduate Department of women, and ordered its formal opening so soon as eight fellowships were assured. Dr. Pepper announced that the requisite number of fellowships, each of an annual value of $375, and tenable for two years, are now offered in this department, and that he had just received from Col. Bennett $15,000 as his contribution to the endowment fund. The total amount of endowment required to develop this new department and to extend freely its advantages will be not less than $100,000. "The University of Pennsylvania leads the way in a new field of educational work of the highest importance and significance. It marks an epoch in the history of the higher education of women; it has already incited to similar action in other quarters; and it will enable us to feel that no longer can the reproach be made that the splendid facilities for original research and for advanced study in this great university—many of which are due to the generosity of women—are reserved exclusively for men." A student in this graduate department for women must pursue graduate studies for at least two years, and must present herself for examination in three of the twenty-one courses of the Department of Philosophy. The woman's school will be governed by a mixed Board of Managers, consisting of the Provost as President *ex-officio* and some twenty ladies and gentlemen. It is encouraging to know that practically the only limit to women enjoying all the advantages of a great university is the capacity to pay for them *en gros*. Indeed, the Trustees state, through the Provost, that they are willing to provide a separate *college* for women, provided the means can be found.

—On April 11, the Rev. A. C. Headlam of All Souls' College, Oxford, read before the Hellenic Society an account of the monastery and church at Koja Kalessi in the Byzantine province of Isauria, a part of Cilicia Trachea. Laborde visited the site in 1826, but the account of it in his 'Voyage en Orient,' under the name of Aladja Khan, is that of an artist rather than an archæologist. Messrs. Headlam, Ramsay, and Hogarth have therefore been the first to discover its unique archæological importance. At first sight it might appear to be a basilica of the older type, but it has a central tower and has not a continuous row of equal columns. It is not less removed from the later type of Byzantine church, and apparently represents a transition from the older oblong basilica to the later church with a central dome—the church of Justinian's day. It has no dome and no external apse; chambers are built on either side of the sanctuary. An earlier date than the fifth century B. C. would require the altar to be at the west end, as in the case of old St. Peter's at Rome and in San Paolo fuori le Mura, and would not agree with the Byzantine design and workmanship of its capitals. But it must have been built early in the fifth century, for there is an entire absence of distinctively Christian symbolism in its ornamentation, and the design of its doorways almost suggests that they were taken from a pagan temple. The date, 461 A. D., on an epitaph of the site may give some clue. The second paper was by Mr. Louis Dyer, on "The Intervention of Athena in Heroic Affairs." A sufficiently clear and consistent account of Athena might, he contended, be derived from the poets. Therefore the need of new light from investigations of ritual was not so pressing as in dealing with Zeus, Dionysus, or Artemis. The earliest Athena of various local cults had grown into the universal goddess of skill and quick resource before the era of the Homeric poems. She showed men how to be themselves—for good, if good was in them, but sometimes also for evil. Skill of all kinds was in her gift, and in the Homeric poems she both gives and guides the mind of war and adventure. In the first two books of the 'Odyssey' we have the *Lehrjahre*, in the third and fourth the *Wanderjahre*, of Telemachus. The Athena who guides him throughout is a spiritualized counterpart of Athena Kourotrophos as worshipped on the Athenian Acropolis. Her help in war is of the same purely spiritual quality, and when (as in the 22d 'Odyssey') this is incompatible with a congruous dramatic situation, the poet does not flinch from the truth. There Athena-Mentor summons Odysseus to stand by her and see what she can do, and then, unaccountably as some say, she disappears. It is only by grace of Athena that Odysseus is his own clever self. This is shown by the sorry figure which he cuts without her. From the moment of his departure from Troy to his shipwreck on Scheria, he has recourse to her only once, when he escapes from Polyphemus. Else where he invariably falls far short of himself, showing bad generalship, bad seamanship, and finally incurring the just displeasure of Æolus as one under the ban of heaven. The battles of the 'Iliad' and the Labors of Heracles are full of the intervention of Athena, who is the voice of wisdom in practical affairs. Hence Eustathius identifies her with the virtue of φρόνησις, Practical Wisdom.

GARDINER'S HISTORY OF THE GREAT CIVIL WAR.—I.

History of the Great Civil War, 1642–1649. By Samuel R. Gardiner. Vol. III., 1647–1649. Longmans, Green & Co. 1891.

MR. GARDINER has completed his annals of the Great Civil War; he has reached the third stage in his monumental history of the age of the Stuarts. The moment is opportune for forming an estimate of his position among investigators of the past. It is the more natural to do so because Mr. Gardiner, in his last volume, pronounces a verdict on the character of Cromwell; and the extent to which we accept Mr. Gardiner's conclusions on a most intricate question of fact and of ethics must depend on our opinion of our author's capacity for the discharge of an historian's judicial functions.

Two qualities preëminently fit him for filling the judgment-seat of history: they are thoroughness and impartiality. Of the thoroughness of Mr. Gardiner's work it is impossible to speak too highly. We have all heard the story of the historian who refused to read new documents because his history was written and his opinions made up. This anecdote, which is told of many writers, may after all be true of none. It certainly would lack not only truth but plausibility if told of Mr. Gardiner. A critic would be dull or malignant indeed who could read his pages without perceiving that his life had been one of continuous, laborious, thorough-going research. That any man should know everything that may ultimately be known about a great era is an impossibility. But it would hardly be rash to assume that our author has, up to the point at which he has arrived, collected as much information about the years in the annals of England of which he treats as the undaunted industry of one man could bring together. He is not a great narrator; he does not display that power, which seems in England to have died out with Macaulay, of marshalling together masses of facts in clear and orderly narrative so as to tell their own tale and of themselves impress on the reader their own natural and inevitable moral. He has nothing like the brilliancy as a painter of particular scenes displayed by Froude, and occasionally by Motley. He does not exhibit the analytical penetration of Tocqueville. But his very shortcomings as a writer, and even, if one may say so with the deepest respect, as a thinker, make the more visible his thoroughness as an inquirer. He does not possess the art of concealing his method of work. Hence any observant critic can perceive his conscientiousness as a workman.

Nor is it disrespectful to add a remark with which, we strongly suspect, Mr. Gardiner would himself agree, that since the day—now, we believe, at least thirty years distant—when he began his great historical work, both his knowledge and his powers have immensely increased. His method of treating his subject is the method, to a great extent, of an annalist. He goes calmly on from year to year from the beginning to now nearly the middle of the seventeenth century. Each year his research makes greater discoveries, both because of the use he can make of his immense accumulative knowledge, and because habits of observation strengthen his capacity to observe. The book produced becomes, in short, almost a perfect and complete chronicle of a past age. We can read in Mr. Gardiner's pages the annual register of the reigns of James I. and Charles I.

Mr. Gardiner's thoroughness is, if possible, surpassed by his impartiality. If it were in accordance with modern taste to appropriate particular epithets to particular authors, he would be referred to as the "impartial Gardiner," just as the author of the 'Ecclesiastical Polity' is designated as the judicious Hooker. For Mr. Gardiner's impartiality is a virtue, or a quality, different not only in degree but in kind from the fairness of any honest writer. A narrator is generally counted fair if he takes due pains to ascertain his facts; if he sets down nothing in reference to men or

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

events which he does not, on good, solid, rational ground, believe to be true; if he suppresses no fact, whether it tell for or against his views or opinions, which has a material bearing on the matter with which he is concerned, and if he does not attempt, by rhetoric or other means, to bias the minds of his readers—that is, to lead them to conclusions beyond the inferences which the evidence, when fairly stated, supports. A writer, further, who pretends to real fairness will, especially in estimating the moral character of men's actions, try to distinguish between inferences which seem to him to possess moral certainty, and conclusions which at best are only probable. Few indeed are the historians who attain to this degree of fairness, but Mr. Gardiner seeks to reach, and often does reach, a higher, certainly a different, kind of impartiality. He wishes, where he judges at all, to pronounce a sympathetic, and therefore, in most cases, a lenient judgment on the men of past ages. He will not hand them over to the penalties of posthumous blame without bringing before the tribunal of opinion all the possible considerations which may turn, or sway, or lighten our judgment.

The kind of difference which marks off Mr. Gardiner from every historian with whom we are acquainted may be seen if we set side by side with his history Dr. Arnold's 'History of Rome.' No one but a fool or a fanatic ever accused Dr. Arnold of unfairness. A certain stern sense of justice was a marked trait of a character which, even in his writings, appears more admirable than amiable. That he never made a statement which he believed or suspected to be false, or suppressed a statement which he believed to be true, may be taken as certain. But though Arnold acted and wrote with the utmost fairness, no sagacious critic will ever maintain that Dr. Arnold's judgments were invariably fair. Still less are they marked by intellectual impartiality. Certain types of character excited his distaste no less than his moral reprobation; he viewed them in the light of a censor, and the sternness of censure is inconsistent with the indifference of criticism. To a man, for example, of the priestly type, it was hardly possible for Arnold to do complete justice; it would have been impossible for him to weigh in the same scales the feelings of Laud and of Baxter. With Mr. Gardiner it is otherwise. It is his conscientious endeavor (and often the attempt is successful) to look at the politicians or theologians of the past as they might, he conceives, have looked at themselves—to urge, for example, in mitigation of any harsh judgment on Charles or on Cromwell, all that the King or the Protector might by possibility have pleaded on his own behalf. Mr. Gardiner also exercises a kind of charity in judging the acts of his fellow-men, which, when applied to the conduct either of contemporaries or of the actors in the history of the past, is, to say the least, rare. He considers, in effect, what is the most favorable interpretation which can by possibility be placed upon their words or actions; and this interpretation is practically the explanation of their career which he adopts.

That this gift of impartiality, this capacity for preserving the attitude of a lenient judge, is a very singular and in many respects admirable endowment for an historian, is past dispute. The possession thereof, combined, of course, with the habit of studious research, enables Mr. Gardiner in many cases to place the character of individuals in a new and favorable light. We are inclined to think that, speaking generally, nothing but good results from this talent for impartiality as regards Mr. Gardiner's treatment of the secondary characters of the age with which he deals. We have not the least doubt that, on the whole, we get from him a fairer and truer view of English High Churchmen who lived during the reign of James and of Charles than is obtainable from any other writer, whether Whig or Tory. He puts in a strong light the liberal side of Anglicanism; he makes his readers perceive that Laud, for example, may have appeared to his friends no less than to himself the opponent of Calvinistic intolerance; and though we may perhaps suspect that a combination of churchmanship and liberality is the form of religion which preëminently commends itself to Mr. Gardiner's own sympathies, it would be the highest injustice to hint or imply that he did not embrace in his intellectual charity teachers of a class for whom churchmen have not much tolerance. From one of the accidents of history, Hugh Peters is the traditional representative of vulgar and truculent Puritanism. Mr. Gardiner happily shows that the received picture of Peters is a mere caricature. He seems to have been exactly what would now be called a man of genial nature.

"His letters show him," writes Gardiner, "as he really was, fond of a jest, much concerned in the price of corn and butter, and taking the opportunity of a sermon to recommend the settlers [in New England] to raise a stock for fishing, but anxious withal for the righteousness as well as for the material prosperity of the colony. . . . Peters's love of liberty was not a high intellectual persuasion like that of Vane. . . . It sprang from the kindliness of a man of genial temper, to whom minute theological study was repulsive, and who, without disguising his own opinions, preferred goodness of heart to rigidity of doctrine."

In his description of Hugh Peters Mr. Gardiner is at his best. He understands his man and makes his reader understand him too. He shows us both the virtues and defects of the Puritan minister, and also explains how it happened that comparatively superficial faults have concealed from Hugh Peters's adversaries, as they have concealed from posterity, the sterling excellence of a teacher who in some ways was in advance of his age. The admirable results of our author's sympathetic equity are never more apparent than when he deals with classes. The attitude of Cavaliers, of Puritans, of lawyers, of soldiers, of statesmen, and of zealots during the most critical period of English history, becomes, as we read his pages, thoroughly intelligible. We see that England was divided into hostile camps because there was real cause for division. We are led not to think that there was nothing to choose between Roundheads and Cavaliers, but to perceive that when the Civil War broke out, it was a difficult thing enough for a man of sense and honor to decide whether he would stand by the Parliament or by the Crown. Mr. Gardiner puts an end for ever to the delusion that a man could not be a Parliamentarian unless he were a fanatic, or a Royalist unless he were a courtier.

Is it, however, the case that Mr. Gardiner's knowledge and fairness make him a thoroughly satisfactory critic of character and conduct? We cannot answer this question with an unhesitating affirmative. Leniency and charitableness keep a judge from committing one class of mistakes, but they do not of themselves supply insight into human nature, or bestow the faculty for forcing truth out of the mouths of mendacious witnesses. Mr. Gardiner fails sometimes to realize the possibilities of human vice or wickedness. He has devoted much thought and trouble to the study of James the First. We have the advantage in this particular instance of possessing, in the 'Dictionary of National Biography,' our author's final estimate of the first of the Stuarts who reigned over England. It is on the whole a very favorable one, compared with the judgment which is passed on the King by men who look mainly at his weaknesses and his vices. Mr. Gardiner perceives that James was endowed with more than average intellectual power, and keeps constantly before the minds of his readers the consideration that James's difficulties arose in part from the King being in some points in advance of his age. James desired and planned the union of Scotland and England. He wished to maintain a policy, if not of toleration, yet of ecclesiastical moderation. He perceived the gigantic evils of foreign war; he was, in an age of warfare, a man of peace. In spite of his weaknesses, he achieved in Scotland considerable political success, and in England, after all, avoided the errors which led his son to ruin. He was, in short, a monarch whom from one point of view it was possible, if not to respect, yet to admire; and Mr. Gardiner, if he does nothing more, explains to us how a man like Casaubon or Bacon might flatter James without conscious hypocrisy or servility.

What Mr. Gardiner does not bring into view is the possibility—or the probability—that James's life was disgraced by sins which more than justified popular distrust. The darker side of the transactions which led to the trial and imprisonment of Somerset hardly arrests Mr. Gardiner's attention. The interpretation which he places on James's fear lest Somerset should reveal some dangerous secret is possibly the right one; it is not, we think, the explanation which most naturally commends itself to any one who reflects upon the strangeness of James's conduct, and the high probability of his holding and carrying into practice the doctrine that kings were not tied by the moral rules which ought to govern ordinary men. Whatever be the true solution of the King's conduct—and at least two or three are possible—there is something singularly feeble in the conclusion that James's anxiety arose from the knowledge that Somerset knew more about the King's dealings with Spain than James cared to have openly known. Yet this is, in effect, Mr. Gardiner's final judgment on the whole matter.

Why is it that a writer so judicious comes to so impotent a conclusion? The question suggests to us the real defects in Mr. Gardiner's mode of judging men. The first is, that he brings to the task of historical judgment very little of what we may call worldly knowledge. There never was an historian of sense and ability who was less of a man of the world. It is quite impossible that either Gibbon or Hallam or Macaulay—writers as different from one another as well can be found—could have passed so lightly as has Mr. Gardiner over the effect on our judgment of James of his admitted faults and weaknesses, such as his cowardice, his grossness, and his tolerance for grossness and viciousness in others. Mr. Gardiner's second defect—and it is a far deeper and subtler fault than want of worldly knowledge—is that he has formed a false conception of the kind of impartiality that should be practised by an historian. An inquirer into the history of the past is neither a moralist nor a judge. The distinction between their respective duties is of the highest importance. A moralist man rightly, as a precept for the conduct

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of life, enjoin upon others, and himself practise, the virtue of charity. He may tell us, and with truth, that we best avoid the risk of injustice and unkindness to our neighbors by forming a charitable judgment of their conduct—that is to say, by putting on the acts of our fellow-men the very best construction of which they by any possibility admit. The duty of a judge is not the discovery of truth, but the determination of the question whether a given person is proved to be guilty of crime. A judge, therefore, wisely acts on the principle that no man is to be found guilty of an offence if his innocence is even a possibility. But the whole aim of an historian is the discovery and the statement of truth. With the charity which thinks no evil, with the judicial principle that it is more important that ten criminals escape punishment than that one innocent man be unjustly punished, he has no concern whatever. He must constantly deal not with certainties, but with probabilities. Undue leniency in judging men's actions is in him as distinct a vice as undue severity. This is a truth which Mr. Gardiner forgets. The impartiality of the judgment-seat is not the impartiality needed for the discharge of an historian's judicial functions. His aim is knowledge; he should practise not only the open-mindedness, but also the severity, of the scientific inquirer.

MORE NOVELS.

The Deluge. By Henryk Sienkiewicz. Translated from the Polish by Jeremiah Curtin. Boston: Little, Brown & Co.

Rowena in Boston. By Maria Louise Pool. Harper & Bros.

A Member of the Third House. By Hamlin Garland. Chicago: F. J. Schulte & Co.

The Governor, and Other Stories. By George A. Hibbard. Charles Scribner's Sons.

'The Deluge,' a booklet of 1,258 pages, is a sequel to the 800 pages of 'Fire and Sword,' so that we are now in a position to know all about it, provided Mr. Sienkiewicz and Mr. Curtin have dealt honestly by us as to truths of history and of translation, and we cannot entertain a doubt on either point. The adventures which are set forth in these narrow limits are not only enacted upon the page, but related and re-related to different characters in the book, until the reader finds himself in the position of the musical critic at Bayreuth who wondered that Wagner had not spared himself the trouble of repeated explanations on the stage, by allowing the persons of the drama to go out between the acts and purchase a book of the play. Condensation in the present case would have been easy, and would have lessened the impending danger that the readers of this novel will be limited to the patient reviewers and to Mr. Charles A. Dana, to whom the translation is dedicated. But there is no cloud without its silver lining: it is hardly possible that the editor of the *Sun* should have time in one season to read 'The Deluge' and to elect his candidate, and we may therefore reasonably hope that in *reading* history he will be precluded from making it.

The rising of Cossacks and Tartars in 1648 against the commonwealth of Poland, Lithuania, and Russia, having been disposed of in 'Fire and Sword,' there follows in 'The Deluge' the history of the wars of the commonwealth a few years later against the Swedes, under Charles Gustavus, when Poland enlisted on her side the terrible Tartars, and never knew from day to day if her sister States would stand by her or join the invading Swedes. The heads of the confederate principalities desired more or less to be true to the commonwealth, and desired as well to keep in sight the elective office of King of Poland. This portion of Poland's history, while hardly less bloody than the preceding period, is varied by the stories of a hundred treasons, plots, and stratagems, and, though only a little later in date, comes nearer to the modern idea than the history of a war with barbarians. Kmita, the hero of 'The Deluge,' is a wild flaming firebrand, who thinks to serve his country by fighting under the banner of the Lithuanian Prince Radziwill. Soon convinced that though Radziwill may have one eye on his country, he certainly has both upon the crown of Poland, Kmita, in flaming wrath, turns his back upon the traitor, and hews his way, through countless perils, to his King, John Casimir. Naturally suspected by all patriots, and especially by his lady-love, Kmita has a bitter experience of the difficulty of getting rid of a bad name. He flings himself into the cause of his church and his country, endures peril and torment, saves, by unheard-of daring, the fortified Convent of Czenstochowa, abducts a prince of the house of Radziwill, rescues the King from deadly danger, and then, gathering and training a horde of Tartars, blazes through the land in a hundred frightful battles, and so to days of peace for the commonwealth and to his own reward. His friends are our old ones of 'Fire and Sword'—the little game-cock, Wolodiowski, twitching his moustaches, sputtering gallantry and patriotism, supreme with the sabre; Zagloba, still shirking, scheming, bragging, guzzling, and beloved; Skszetuski and his beautiful Helena, whose fortunes made the love story of the earlier book, and who have now subsided into a seemly wedded unimportance. Kmita and his Minerva-like Alexandra take their places as lovers, and never had lovers more storm and stress to separate them. The book closes with the dearly-bought peace that at last followed the deluge of war, thanks mainly to the sword of the great general, Czarnietcki. Radziwill and the other interlopers being balked of their election, the crown remains upon the head of the rightful owner, and the subsequent abdication of John Casimir is probably postponed to the next novel.

There are scenes of thrilling interest in the history of this war. Most impressive, perhaps, is the siege of Czenstochowa, already referred to, where the friars defended their convent against the daily attacks of the godless foe, smiling at the pangs of famine, and singing hymns nightly upon their beleaguered walls. At last a great gun takes effect, making a breach too great to be filled, and ruin is only a question of time. Says Kmita to the prior: "Beloved father, there is a great heart in you, heroic and holy, but you do not understand cannon." Whereupon, by a dashing expedient, he blows up the gun, the convent is saved, and the country is thrilled from torpor into a united resistance against the foe who had dared threaten a sacred retreat. Kmita is, throughout, a figure to appeal to the coldest imagination, with his rages, his hates, his furies of vengeance and of loyalty, while his submission to all that separates him from his happiness, and makes him worthy of it in the end, is full of pathos. The austere figure of Alexandra has for foil that of Anusia, as modern a little flirt as can be found in fiction. The many kings, princes, and hetmans are remarkably well differentiated, considering their number; with a like modifying clause, the same may be said of the battles, the sieges, the forays, the tortures, and the ingenuities of brutality of a brutal age; but this does not save them from the charge of an intemperate overplus of being, which in art is a misdemeanor unless it be a crime.

Once, in speaking on the art of fiction, Mr. Walter Besant advised the young novelist to remember that in story-telling, as in almsgiving, a cheerful countenance works wonders. Consciously or not, the author of 'Roweny in Boston' has carried out this advice to the letter. From the first page to the last the story is told with a smile—though it must be confessed that, as regards the too recurrent terrier Marmaduke, the smile grows a trifle stereotyped. The heroine, it is true, mingles some nostalgic tears with her "light-housekeeping" in the attic-room on Hudson Street; the art student's inevitable moments of despair are hers, and she knows the craven thought, "I can go home. If I can't get a school, I can do slop-work." But she is really too clever and charming a maiden—a sort of *fin de siècle* cousin to Phœbe Pyncheon—not to win her way at the "Hub," and not to find that romance can send up some healthy shoots through the crevices left by psychical research, Christian science, theosophy, and the Browning Club.

Like Rowena at her brush, Miss Pool may be said to have the "touch." By a few lively strokes of her pen, her characters are made clear in outline, and are then left to explain themselves by their own words and actions. This they do with sufficient definiteness to prove that neither a talent for psychological analysis nor a gift of word-painting is essential to success as a novelist. Miss Pool has evidently had her eyes about her in more than one corner of Boston, but it is nevertheless her provincials that she understands to the ground. In these days, when realism, as applied to American fiction, is too nearly a synonymous term for vulgarity, it is refreshing to come across an author who is realistic without commonness and humorous without vulgarity. Rowena never blushed for her kith and kin in Middle Village, nor need the reader.

Those who insist on extracting a moral from every story will find one here made to their hand. If slight in fibre, it is at least a new motive in fiction, and has perhaps the merit of timeliness. It is that when a fascinating woman and a man are each contending for the first place in the affections of any young woman, it is always in the end, no matter what the first fancy of the young woman may be, "the masculine element which prevails." Beside this moral, there is an explicit lesson in charity. It is this: though a young man wear a monocle, have difficulty in pronouncing the letter *r*, and belong to "the very best set in Boston," he may yet, if very much in earnest, behave like a good fellow. The improvement in construction of this book upon the author's last, 'Dally,' warrants the hope that she can accomplish still better things.

Mr. Garland's latest venture in holding up the mirror to his compatriots is charged with high moral indignation. A righteous effort to bring to judgment the political trickster and all his works is so laudable, whatsoever its form, that the pity is all the greater when a story with this purpose in view turns the sharp edge of its weapons against itself. The cause, here, of this mischance, is not that the society revolving around "the Capitol" in an unnamed city and State is drawn as hopelessly vulgar. It would be wide of the mark to insist that the average member of a "House"—

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

whether second or first—at ease with himself and the rest of the world, in the ornamental bar-room of his favorite hotel, should be held up as a spectacle edifying to gods and men; neither is an "Iron Duke," his confidential secretary, who is at the same time a "King of the lobby," nor even his only daughter (though the American girl is proverbially quick to learn), of necessity a model of good breeding and a well of English undefiled. But even where the dramatis personæ are such as these, there are certain points of style and manner which the writer of realistic fiction must bear in mind if, when he is picturing common people, his book is not to be on a level with his people.

In addition, for instance, to the vocabulary he must use in furnishing forth the speech of his characters, he needs also to have at command, on his own proper behalf, a vocabulary and diction conformable to the requirements of polite English. By some means or other, moreover, he must succeed in creating the impression that between himself and his reader there exists a clear, though tacit, understanding in regard to a standard of mind and manners separate and apart from that of his underbred personages. Otherwise vulgarity will stamp not alone his characters, but also his story. Every story, according to a clever critic of to-day, must consist of an idea and a picture. To the idea of 'A Member of the Third House' there are few or no objections to be raised. Its author, if he means to produce pictures instead of travesties of American manners, has still to learn to paint, not with the brush that furnishes the glaring figures of the advertiser, but with the touch and tone of the artist.

Mr. Hibbard's sins against the canons of fiction are so many that it would be difficult to enumerate them briefly. To sum them up in a general confession, not one of the six stories reprinted under the title of the first in order, "The Governor," succeeds in carrying conviction to the mind of the reader. The air of reality, which is, after all, the supreme merit of a story, and which should be complete enough wholly to conceal the shifts and contrivances of the story-teller at work, is wanting, not less in the sensational attempt at portraying the emotions of a self-supposed murderer, who is rescued by an easy device from the consequences of a "mad, bad" hour, than in the highly unpsychological study of the interior transformation of a worldly old gentleman at the sight of his old home, his old rival, and his old love. Mr. Hibbard makes spirited dashes at difficult motives for short stories, and his failures are all in the line of ambition. He has fortunately—although he still leaves much to be desired in simplicity of expression—already emerged head and shoulders from the inept verbiage of a recent volume; and where there are so many signs of promise as in these latest stories, the hopeful reader is justified in expecting good things yet to come.

ROBERT TOOMBS.

Robert Toombs: Statesman, Speaker, Soldier, Sage. His Career in Congress and on the Hustings—His Work in the Courts—His Record with the Army—His Life at Home. By Pleasant A. Stovall. Cassell Publishing Co. 1892.

THE old-fashioned title-page of Mr. Stovall's book is like an old-time feast—everything is spread out at once. Of the four items of its sibillant alliteration, however, "Statesman, Speaker, Soldier, Sage," only two are made fairly good in the subsequent delineation. The attempt to represent Toombs as a statesman fails conspicuously, and there is no attempt to represent him as a sage—which is well, for such an attempt could have been only ridiculous. Whatever the virtues of the man (and virtues were not wanting), and whatever the defects (and they were many and have not been disguised), no man was ever less a sage.

When we consider the prominence that Toombs enjoyed in the great debate which led up to the Civil War, in the proximate circumstances of secession, and in the following strife, it cannot be charged upon our author that he has unduly magnified his task. His book has only 396 pages, and there is little on a page, the margins are so generous and the type is so big. As little can it be charged that he has written his biography with any desire to prolong the animosities of a most miserable and hateful time. He is undisguisedly in sympathy with Toombs, and generally speaks of him in an exaggerated tone, but he has no recriminations for the North and no disparagement of the Union party. Indeed, there is something pathetic in his imperfect characterization of Lincoln, the intention is so manifestly kind. It prophesies a time when the name of Lincoln will be, with that of Washington, a bond of sympathy between all parts of the country which he loved with undivided heart. Mr. Stovall has chosen one of Toombs's most conciliatory sentences for the motto of his title-page, and a passage of like import for a fuller motto following the dedication.

The most obvious defect of the book is its superficiality. It is no memoir to serve the uses of the historian, so little does it give us of the "true inwardness" of Toombs and others in their correspondence antecedent to the war. It may be said that Toombs had nothing to conceal. He was a man who always wore his heart upon his sleeve; whose sword was never in its sheath. Nevertheless he passed from one position to another, and his letters must, it would seem, have indicated the steps by which he did so. They are not indicated here. The lack is particularly noticeable in the years corresponding to his passage from the Whig party to the Democratic, for he was not "a life-long Democrat," as one of the most copious reviewers of this book has represented him, with astonishing inattention to its representations, which on this head are as clear as possible. He was a Whig until the campaign of 1852; an independent, bolting Whig in that campaign, refusing to vote for Gen. Scott, and supporting Webster heartily and hopelessly; and, Webster dying just before the election, Toombs swept his Georgia contingent into the Democratic ranks. In 1844, advocating the claims of Henry Clay, he made one of the first speeches that brought him into general recognition. It was delivered in New York. It was sharply critical of Calhoun's protection for slave labor as the *summum bonum*. If any discrimination was made, he declared that it should be made in favor of free labor. Paradoxical as it may seem, "Mr. Toombs was actually charged in this campaign with being an abolitionist," and was obliged to defend himself. He opposed the acquisition of Texas, preferring "the Union without Texas to Texas without the Union," and describing the Mexican war in terms hardly more flattering than those of Hosea Biglow.

But Toombs was not a strong, self-centred man. He was an ardent demagogue, and, as such, extremely sensitive to the influence of popular opinion. As this tended more and more, midway of the century, to make slavery the great Diana of the Ephesians, he grovelled with the rest, and, in the memorable contest for the Speakership in 1849, demanding from the Northern Whigs that there should be no restriction of slavery in the Territories, and, failing to obtain the concession, he split the caucus and led off the Southern faction to the support of Howell Cobb, a Georgia Democrat. Threats of disunion foamed upon his lips, and were from that time on his first resort whenever he sought to force the North to do the bidding of the South, though it was as a warm Unionist that he went back to his constituents after the compromise measures of 1850 had been passed. That he was again suspected of "unsoundness on the slavery question" only shows that in some minds slavery without disunion already seemed impossible.

Entering the Senate in 1853, Toombs's most interesting aspect there is in the fascination which Stephen A. Douglas exercised upon his mind. The picture of his face at this time is full of glowing sensuousness and arrogant self-confidence—a handsome face, in striking contrast with the frontispiece, which shows the ravages of age and evil habits. In the Kansas-Nebraska controversy he was for the most vigorous and rigorous application of the pro-slavery doctrines at every stage. If Frémont was elected, he would "call upon his countrymen to take that to which they would be driven—the sword." The attraction of Douglas for him was more personal than political. He acknowledged "but one greater, and he the Apostle Paul"; but Douglas's squatter sovereignty did not meet with his approval, and he declared that if he had not been called away from Washington in 1856, Douglas would never have "gone off on that tangent." He was not in Charleston at the Convention of 1860, but he approved the action of Yancey and the seceding minority, and, when the anti-Douglas Convention at Baltimore nominated Breckinridge, Toombs gave him his unqualified support. In Georgia he did not secure for him a majority of the popular vote. When Toombs became a Democrat, it was not in any half-way fashion. He opposed internal improvements at the national expense, and went so far as to preach the doctrine of Herbert Spencer, that the postal service should not be a Government affair.

After Lincoln's election, Toombs bent all his energies toward hastening secession, while in his last speech in the Senate, January 7, 1861, he named impossible concessions to the South which would keep her in the Union. Mr. Stovall contends that it was the ghost of Toombs's Whiggery that lost him the Presidency of the Confederacy; but he allows that there is another explanation—his conduct at a convivial party on the eve of the election in Montgomery. There is nothing in his previous or subsequent history to suggest that he would have made a better President than Davis. Their temperaments were antipodal. Davis had that coldness which the politicians never like. Toombs was far enough from this unpardonable sin: he was nothing if not aflame. Made Secretary of State, he soon came into collision with Davis, whom previous encounters had prepared him to dislike. He opposed the attack on Fort Sumter with clear prescience of its effect upon the North. In a few months his relations with Davis were so much strained that he left the Cabinet and took a commission as brigadier-general. That he was never advanced to a higher rank galled his proud spirit, and in

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

March, 1863, he resigned his command. His later contributions to the war were made as an adjutant and inspector-general of Georgia militia. It is agreed that to command soldiers one must first learn obedience—for Toombs, an impossible acquisition. The "instinct of personal freedom" was too strong in him. He was incapable of discipline or subordination. Moreover, his drinking habits were fatal to his advancement. It is not often that a biographer, especially one so eulogistic as Mr. Stovall, is so frank in his disclosures of his hero's weakness. He has a chapter named "His Great Fault," which, though it gives few particulars, makes it plain enough that Toombs's intemperance was very gross; that it increased during his army life, and excited constant apprehension; that in the last years of his life it quite overmastered him. His personal integrity and purity were in remarkable and happy contrast with his darling sin.

How complete the alienation between Toombs and Davis was at last is shown by the fact that in Washington, Ga., where Davis, fleeing from Richmond, and his Cabinet had their last meeting, though Toombs's own house was close at hand, and he sent a message to Davis, offering help if needed, the two men did not meet. Shortly they were united, together with Alexander Stephens, in Stanton's order for their arrest, and the dullest pages of Mr. Stovall's book are those detailing Toombs's remarkable escape—truly miraculous, he hung about so long and exposed himself so frequently. He remained abroad from November, 1865, until the spring of 1867. Returning to his native State, he resumed the practice of the law with great material success. He remained wholly unreconstructed to the last. The new South had for him no charms; his days were wholly with the dead. Taking a hand in framing the new Constitution of Georgia, he opposed the provision against duelling, in a manner consonant with the uncivilized habit of his life. All of his instincts were those of the barbarian or the semi-civilized man. He would have had no restrictions against bearing arms. Late in life he joined the Methodist Church. But he had nothing to repent of in so doing; with his last breath he said, "I would not blot out a single act of my life."

There are some interesting anecdotes, but not so many as we should expect a life so fashioned and so circumstanced to afford. Toombs met Lincoln when they were both in Congress, and Lincoln objected to sitting at a table of thirteen. Toombs told him he would rather die than be so superstitious. Daniel Webster's readiness to pay the national debt finds a companion story in Toombs's "Georgia shall pay her debts; if she does not, I will pay them for her!" And on two occasions he brought his private purse to the rescue of the public credit. When a Federal officer said to him, "We whipped you, anyhow," he answered, "No; we just wore ourselves out whipping you." His rhetoric was extremely florid, and his biographer's is of the same quality. There is a suggestion of throwing dirt in his metaphor describing Toombs: "He grasped only the great hillocks of thought, and left the intervening ground to be filled by the listener." And, in truth, he had a great gift for throwing dirt; he was a master of vituperation. Thinking with his prejudices and speaking with his passions, he is a capital example of the turbulent, irrational, immoral temper which hurried the South into the Civil War against the judgment of her saner part.

There are some mistakes in the book which the author would do well to correct before it fairly enters on the course of popularity it is likely to enjoy, especially in the Southern States. It should be Dr. Eliphalet Nott on page 13, not "Dr. Eliphalet Knott." On page 309, the date of Mrs. Toombs's joining her husband in Paris should be 1866, not 1865. On the same page Mr. Stovall's valor in comparing Toombs to Mirabeau gets the better of his discretion. The crime which made Toombs a fugitive was treason, and not gross personal immorality.

Latest Literary Essays and Addresses. By James Russell Lowell. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 1892.

THE volume in which Lowell's last essays are garnered is almost exclusively of literary interest. To an unusual degree it is a students' book. The occasion of several of the essays, meant as prefatory, to other matter, limited their scope and kept the discursive habit of the critic somewhat in check. Lowell required a large field to give him the natural freedom of movement that secured the best results. He was not analytic in method, but intuitive: he illuminates the subject, but does not organize knowledge about it; and consequently the brief monograph, which most demands self-restraint, afforded poor facilities for his genius. The meagreness of some of these pages, in contrast to the common abundant overflow of his mind in discourse, is thus accounted for. The essay upon "Richard III.," for instance, took up the single question of the authorship of the play, and while the topic permitted the author to write of Shakspere's general characteristics, he wrote fluently and delightfully, with equal penetration of thought and breadth of treatment; but there he stopped, and, having stated the point of view and suggested a general argument by naming the tests of authenticity, he leaves the main question at loose ends. For completeness, for conviction, it was neces ary to develop the argument and apply the tests in detail, but to do this was not consonant with his habit of mind. The result is, that one learns Lowell's doubt whether Shakspere wrote the play, but has no opportunity to judge the merits of the case without private study.

The essay on Landor, in the same way, is hardly more than a sketch and a reminiscence. He had written on the main subject before. His immediate task was to furnish an introduction to certain letters of Landor published in a magazine. The slightness of the occasion explains the character of the paper, which was of a temporary interest. The essay upon Milton's 'Areopagitica' was similarly a preface to a reprint of that work, and the one upon "The World's Progress" served a like purpose. Interesting as each is—one for the characterization of Milton as a man alien from his age even in dealing with contemporary politics, the other for the view it gives of what impression science made on Lowell's mind—neither of them is written or conceived in the large manner which we associate with their author's ordinary prose. All these papers reflect the lettered ease of a mind no longer strenuous except on great occasion; they show the scholar among his books, handling his thoughts with a certain unconcernment, content to let them go as they come.

In the three remaining essays there is a more marked engagement of the mind with the subject. Walton is treated with the touch that one gives only to a favorite author. The old angler's personality, his times and friends, interested Lowell, and what we had almost called the unliterary charm of Walton's phrase and moods, his freshness, felicity that seems unsought, his generous share of "nature," stimulated the pleased senses of the critic and drew out his sympathies; so that, in this instance, though the essay was also originally a preface, it takes a place of its own with the other studies in literature which make up the body of Lowell's work.

Gray, however, is the author of whom the best essay is made in this collection. The poet, both in his personality and his fame, gave "ample room and verge enough" for Lowell's distinctive powers. As is so often the case in the long-familiar essays on the older poets, the critic cannot confine himself in any definite limits. He must make his entry through a large portal and discuss the whole century before he has time to remember the particular poet he is to meet at the bar of criticism. Gray is out of sight at the opening, and remains recluse for a considerable waiting-spell. Meanwhile the eighteenth century is surveyed, its great names recalled, its traits singled out with much regretful contrast of past and present humorously thought, and from paragraph to paragraph the page is studded with those brilliant *sententiæ*, compact condensations of taste and judgment, which give to Lowell's best prose its air of world-wisdom. A more just characterization of the century which is the puzzle of our own, and which, by our ineptitude to understand its ways, almost convicts us of that illiberality we most zealously shun, is not to be found; it is worth chapters of literary history as such history is written when that period is treated of. It is brief, but complete and exact, though broad. Of course the figure of Dryden is large on the page, since Lowell never resisted the desire he had to speak of him, just as he always brings in Ben Jonson on the least provocation; but when Gray is finally reached, the special study of his life and genius is conducted with the acuteness, the light revealing touch, the disinterested self-possession, which inevitably force the spirit, whoever he may be, to render up the tale of what he was.

Gray needs to be treated with considerateness, with excellent breeding, for otherwise the most personal phases of his aristocratic and retiring nature would fail of their effect. Lowell's literary manner on this occasion is as perfect as an actor's. He illustrates Gray's character by the way he behaves towards him. We do not undertake to say that this is conscious art; it is probably only literary instinct. But the issue is most happy. We learn the truth about Gray, and our poet is not discomposed by the inquisition. There was a kind of felicity in this that Lowell was master of in all his subtler work, but the secret of it was constitutional, or, as we now say, temperamental.

Akin to this, so well illustrated in the paper on Gray, is the indefinable quality that escapes definition but not perception in the address on the Study of the Modern Languages, by virtue of which, while defending his thesis loyally and better than a more partisan supporter could have done, Lowell yet conveys the impression that he has half the truth in his other hand, and even playfully lets you see it from time to time. The modern languages have the field, it is true, but if courtesy stands in the foreground, honesty looks out behind, and will have to be reckoned with, amicably, of course, but justly. The orator turns the silver side of the shield, and makes it glitter in the light, but his hand is on the dark gold behind, and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

he can't quite keep his eyes off it; or, to drop metaphor, let us say that here, too, Lowell makes his attitude of mind express a large part of his story. In this address, next to the essay on Gray, is the largest portion of that thought, now practical, now profound, which especially distinguishes his last words; and if the entire volume is less rich in this value than preceding ones, it is their light that casts the shade.

European Reminiscences, Musical and Otherwise. By Louis C. Elson. Chicago: Manual Publishing Co. Pp. 301.

MR. ELSON, who is already favorably known to readers of musical literature by his 'History of German Song,' 'Curiosities of Music,' and 'Theory of Music,' has added to his list a new work which combines travel sketches with a narrative of musical encounters—a perfectly "concordant" combination, inasmuch as music is the most peripatetic of all professions. In the course of several visits to Europe Mr. Elson made it a point to arm himself with letters of introduction, hunt up famous musicians, and have a brief chat with them. He was always hospitably received, and consequently has a good deal to report about the appearance and opinions of famous French and German composers, which appeals to the present taste for personal information and includes some details of biographic value.

Among the composers he met were Hiller, Reinecke, Jadassohn, Gade, Svendsen, Lachner, Rheinberger, Massenet, and A. Thomas. Robert Franz Mr. Elson did not meet personally, but received several valuable æsthetic letters from him, which are printed both in the original and in an English version.

Mr. Elson found that Dr. F. Hiller of Cologne "was not acquainted with the works of any of our American composers," but this was hardly a cause for surprise, as that narrow-minded person never even discovered that Germany had produced great composers after Mendelssohn and Schumann. Rheinberger, in Munich, on the other hand, was found "full of interest in American musical matters, and thoroughly conversant with what is going on among us." He and others spoke in the highest terms of their American pupils. In Munich Mr. Elson also met old Lachner, who spoke to him of his *contemporaries*, Beethoven and Schubert. "It was like turning back the hands of the clock half a century or more, to converse with this man. He had been an orchestral leader in Vienna when Schubert was alive! He had composed songs in friendly rivalry with him." Alas and alack! it was not a case of survival of the fittest. One more year added to Schubert's thirty-one would have been infinitely more valuable to the musical world than a hundred years added to Lachner's life.

All these old German musicians naturally proved to be very conservative in their opinions. Thus, Reinecke of Leipzig expressed his fears for new countries and their musical life: "The chief trouble is that they inherit too soon the wealth of the older countries. They receive at once the most highly-spiced and richly developed music of the modern masters, instead of growing up to them as we had to do." But there is another side to this question. There are a good many cobwebs in the brains of those who were thus brought up in Germany on the "old masters"—cobwebs which it is often impossible to dislodge to make room for new impressions. Americans have no cobwebs to brush away, and new composers are appreciated here sooner than in Germany, as our programmes and current criticisms demonstrate. The Germans, of course, consider this a mistake, as their idea is that no man has a right to any appreciation before he is dead.

At Copenhagen Mr. Elson met Gade, who had "fairly outlived those who used to call him 'Mrs. Mendelssohn.'" "He was old and portly, and his appearance would not give a clue to the genius within. Short of stature, round eyes, ruddy face, and bushy gray hair, with a manner in which joviality and impetuosity were combined, Gade impressed one as a professor of the old school, wrapped up entirely in his work and his art."

In a chapter on French music and musicians, Mr. Elson pleads for the introduction in America of certain French laws relating to amusements, especially the law which relates to the payment of a *tantième* to composers, thus protecting them against grasping publishers and managers. In another place he shows how American example has benefited Europeans: "It is no longer a combination of poverty and honor for the musicians in Germany. Mozart's day of suffering is past. An eminent professor at Leipzig told me that the high prices paid in America are having their influence in Germany. The great institutions find that if they wish to keep the musicians from starting for the New World, they must give pecuniary inducements to stay in the Old."

A very graphic account is given in one chapter of a Bayreuth Festival, in which the social side is especially emphasized; in another there is the only description (in a book) that we know of, of Wagner's early opera, "The Fairies," as brought out in Munich. The letters by Franz in chapter xvi. should be read and pondered by all who are lovers of lyric song. Franz, ignored at present, will be honored in the next century as the greatest of all song-writers, with the exception of Schubert.

The greater part of Mr. Elson's book is devoted to rapid sketches of travel in all European countries except Spain and Russia. He finds something new and entertaining to say about every city, and if some of the jokes and anecdotes are rather journalistic than literary, they are readily forgiven because they are so American. In general, Mr. Elson is an unusually optimistic traveller; and even when he has ground for complaint, as in regard to table-d'hôte dinners and German beds, he chooses the humorous form of exaggerated invective. He had the good (or bad) luck to be in Naples at the time of the great earthquake in Ischia, which is graphically described in chapter xi. The absence of an index to these 'Reminiscences' is to be regretted.

The Hell of Dante Alighieri. Edited, with translation and notes by Arthur John Butler. Macmillan. 1892. Pp. xvi., 435.

RECENTLY, in reviewing Prof. Norton's translation of 'Purgatory,' we had occasion to speak of Mr. Butler's work, which, we said, is the only serious competitor of Prof. Norton's. But we pointed out that, despite a certain virile and straightforward style and, frequently, apt renderings of particular passages, Mr. Butler is, in the long run, inferior to Prof. Norton. This conclusion is confirmed by a comparison of his just-issued translation of 'Hell' with Prof. Norton's translation. Mr. Butler states in his preface that he would not have undertaken to make a version of 'Hell' but for the fact that Dr. Carlyle's work is still in copyright. His purpose, as he remarked in an earlier preface, has been not to make his translation an addition to English literature, but a "crib" whereby English readers can get acquainted with the masterpiece of Italian literature. And in this he has succeeded more than fairly well. His edition is eminently one to be recommended to those who are beginning the study of Dante; for, on the same page, they will find translation, text, and notes.

Of the translation, we may say, in brief, that it has the same qualities which distinguish its predecessors—clearness, straightforwardness, and generally a very literal following of the original. Here and there, we are surprised, however, to see Mr. Butler strain at remote interpretations. Thus, at the very start, he translates *mi ritrovai* (i, 2), "I came to myself," justifying this version by the emphatic prefix *ri*. But surely there is nothing to indicate that Dante had lost consciousness just before the opening of the 'Divine Comedy'; the simplest meaning, "I found myself," is doubtless the best, since in colloquial Italian to-day *mi ritrovai* means just that, and not "I came out of a swoon." So he translates *chiavar l'uscio* (xxxiii, 46), "nail up the door;" though the first meaning, "lock the door," is sufficient. Certainly, when Count Ugolino and his sons heard the outer entrance of their dungeon locked, and the jailers go away, they had a sufficiently horrible premonition of the doom awaiting them. There is absolutely no reason for nailing up a prisoner's door which has already been strongly locked and bolted. We cite these two instances merely to show how Mr. Butler, like almost all Dante students, occasionally goes afield for a recondite interpretation where it would be wiser to stick to the letter of the original; for no poet more often than Dante uses words in their primal sense. But in the main this translation is trustworthy, and it cannot fail to be of great service to those who read it side by side with the text. For more intimate and felicitous renderings, and for a more thoroughly Dantesque spirit, we recommend them, after they have mastered this, to turn to Mr. Norton's version.

The text has been carefully collated, and in those cases where there are important variations, they are given in a foot-note. The notes themselves are quite copious enough, without going into the intricacies in which so many Dante commentators have lost themselves and their readers. Mr. Butler gives sufficient attention to the historical allusions, and quotes liberally from the earlier glosses, especially from that of Benvenuto da Imola. He says wisely, in his preface, that students will do well to eschew all commentators between 1400 and 1800. Indeed, the time has come when a scholar who should produce a *variorum* edition of the 'Divine Comedy' similar to that which Mr. H. H. Furness is producing for Shakspere's plays, would earn the permanent gratitude of other scholars throughout the world. The notes to Mr. Butler's volume show that he has taste and common sense, qualities which are too often undeveloped in the German and Italian students of Dante. In a glossary at the end, he furnishes philological information concerning the more important words of the text. In conclusion, we repeat that beginners will find Mr. Butler's edition the best in English for prosecuting the study of Dante up to that point when no translation satisfies, because the original has become sufficiently familiar to require none.

The House Comfortable. By Agnes Bailey Ormsbee. Harper & Bros.

IT is a somewhat thankless task to attempt to teach the rudiments of common sense and to

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

give an acceptable outline of the details of domestic economy in the same breath. Those who have the former will be disposed to resent as superfluous many of the directions in 'The House Comfortable,' while those who unfortunately have it not, will not be likely to imbibe it from the printed page, but will in all probability have to work out their own salvation by actual experience with "the butcher, the baker, the candlestick-maker." There are, however, no doubt, a number of housekeepers who take their vocation seriously enough to make it worth their while to pick out the plums of information from the homely mixture of things that need to be said and things that go without saying, offered in these pages. They give a fair share of attention to the ornamentation of the home as well as to the equipment of cellar, kitchen, nursery, and sewing-room. The love of ornamentation and a certain amount of skill in it are not what the average young woman of the present generation is most apt to lack. What she lacks to a serious and almost alarming degree is the opportunity, or the ability, or both, to provide herself with suitable and permanent domestic service. Any advice that would help her to solve the problem of getting her home kept in order without the risk of nervous prostration, or the necessity for querulous complaints of cooks and housemaids, ought to be hailed as a boon. The preparations for making a home, manifold as Mrs. Ormsbee shows them to be, are but a skirmish compared with the steady engagement that is to follow. Until the question of responsible service for the housekeeper of moderate means has moved a stage or two nearer solution, the literature that treats of the acquirement of cut glass and decorated porcelain must have an ironical as well as melancholy side.

'The House Comfortable' is, however, on the whole, a creditable contribution towards a right theory of the disbursement of the family means. It treats of already copiously expounded themes, but it is simple and direct in expression and thoroughly honest in tone. Its author has no sympathy with shams or pretensions. A novice in household ways may with advantage keep it on her shelf to consult from time to time as she does those other friends and philosophers, the cook-book and the family journal.

Regards Historiques et Littéraires. Par Vte. E. Melchior de Vogüé. Paris: Armand Colin & Cie.

THE most interesting and successful of the critical papers, reprinted from periodical publications, in this volume are those which concern Russia. M. de Vogüé's special talent lies in happy insight, in felicitous characterization. These are well illustrated in the studies on the poets Neskrasof and Tutchef, and those entitled "Socialist Poetry in Russia" and "Idealist Poetry in Russia." Of the latter poet, who is little known outside his native country, several specimens, in French prose translation, are given. The study upon "Idealist Poetry in France," as represented by Alfred de Vigny, forms the proper complement to this delicately appreciative sketch of Tutchef. The writer also renders the justice of almost unqualified praise to M. Anatole Leroy-Beaulieu's great work, 'L'Empire des Tsars et les Russes.' The most vitally important article relating to France which the volume contains, however, is the opening address, originally written as a New Year's article for January 1, 1892. It displays M. de Vogüé in a field where he is coming to be acknowledged as an authority—the difficult field of adequately describing the great moral and intellectual tendencies of modern France, both in the present and (tentatively) in the future. In "To Those who are Twenty Years of Age," the author sets forth the difference between the Frenchmen of 1870 and those who, called to present themselves for military service in 1890, were lying in their cradles during the last war. "They accept their country as they find it," he says of the rising generation, "taking their place in it without enthusiasm, without impatience, as we inhabit in the most natural manner the city where fate has given us a shelter. The idea of razing it to the earth in order to reconstruct it on a new plan—an idea which constituted the delight of every intelligent Frenchman in former days—has lost ground to an infinite extent in the rising generation." If this be true, and if his other statement be true, that a school-boy is no longer thumped and thrashed by his fellows for "being nothing at all," and not holding set political convictions at a very tender age, the political future of France is not without some guarantee of stability, which will enable the young men to devote themselves with profit to their new passion for studying social problems.

Reviews of French books of travel, history, and social subjects fill up the volume: 'Au Pays du Rein,' by that clever observer, M. J.-J. Weiss; 'Lettres Athéniennes,' by the Comte de Moüy; M. Gabriel Bonvalot's famous 'Les Français au Pamir'; 'Dans l'Inde,' by M. André Chevrillon; 'L'Europe et la Révolution Française,' by M. Albert Sorel; 'Un Regard sur Notre Temps,' by M. le Duc d'Harcourt; 'Essais sur l'Allemagne Impériale,' by M. Ernest Lavisse; 'L'Empire Byzantin,' by Gustave Schlumberger; 'Le Roi Mithridate,' by Théodore Reinach; 'Napoléon et Alexandre Ier,' by M. Albert Vandal, and in another form by the Russian, Sergius Tatishef; 'Le Prince Talleyrand.' 'The Holy Roman Empire,' by Mr. James Bryce, also finds a place. These studies and two sketches, "Au Couvent de Resnoïe" and "Devant 'l'Été' [of M. Puvis de Chavannes]" range in date from 1886 to 1891, and furnish an unequal but, on the whole, a fair example of M. de Vogüé's capacity as a critic of serious books.

Mathematical Recreations, and Problems of Past and Present Times. By W. W. Rouse Ball. Macmillan. 1892.

MR. BALL, whose sketch of the history of mathematics has been noticed in these columns, now selects a subject in which a flimsy treatment is excusable and almost expected; and as his book is decidedly entertaining, perhaps no fault ought to be found with it. On page 33 he gives an amusing example of a fallacy in geometry. The reasoning is of precisely the same nature as that of Euclid i. 16, and of several other theorems which are found in most of the elementary treatises. The only difference is that those propositions are true, or very nearly so, while this amounts to saying that any one line has the same length as any other. If the reasoning were thrown into the form of a *reductio ad absurdum*, it would appear somewhat more deceptive.

The expression "mathematical recreation" has acquired a pretty definite meaning. It signifies a puzzle amusing to any person of average capacity, and involving a mathematical question that does not readily yield to well-known methods. Such, for example, are Solitaire, the Knight's Tour, the arrangement of dominoes so that each number occurs in squares of four. A tolerably complete and accurate account of all such problems hitherto proposed is a desideratum; but the want is hardly filled by a work in which the author ingenuously says of one of his chief topics, "I know nothing of recent Continental works on the subject." This remark, extended to other subjects and other works, would very well describe the method of Mr. Ball's exposition.

Having disposed of mathematical recreations, in 149 pages, Mr. Ball ekes out his volume with five chapters upon miscellaneous subjects, treated in the same scrappy manner, to which copious and obvious references in footnotes impart an air of erudition. There is a chapter upon astrology in which the 'Tetrabiblon' is said to be "ascribed" to Ptolemy. This is not accurate, since the 'Tetrabiblon' *purports* to be by Ptolemy, and is addressed to his brother Syrus, like genuine productions of his pen. There is a chapter upon hyper-space, in which perhaps as good a notion of a fourth dimension is given as could be acquired without serious study; but the sketch of the non-Euclidian geometry is not good, and the results of the "Continental" Klein and Riemann are misstated. There is a chapter upon time and its measurement in which we are informed that the earliest pendulum clock was made by Harris of Covent Garden, some "Continental work" being overlooked. The book concludes with a brief account of some theories, mostly British, of the constitution of matter.

Relation des Missions Scientifiques de MM. H. Hyvernat et P. Müller-Simonis (1888–1889) du Caucase au Golfe Persique à travers l'Arménie, le Kurdistan, et la Mésopotamie. Par P. Müller-Simonis, suivie de notices sur la géographie et l'histoire ancienne de l'Arménie et les inscriptions cunéiformes du bassin de Van par H. Hyvernat. Washington, D. C.: Université Catholique d'Amérique; New York: B. Westermann & Co. 1892.

OUR travellers left Constantinople about the middle of August, 1888, by steamer for Batum. Thence, after being hurried through the Caucasus as soon as their priestly character was discovered, they traversed a small corner of Persia, and entered Turkish territory, involuntarily lingering for a month at Van. Oddly enough, these gentlemen, who had just been expelled from Russia, found it wise to have themselves placed under Russian protection at Van. The English consuls in Armenia M. Simonis characterizes as mere valets of the Turkish authorities. Journeying around Lake Van, they visited Bitlis, Sert, and Mosul, dropping down the Tigris by *kellek* to Bagdad. From here they made a flying trip to the ruins of Babylon, and then, in the latter part of January, 1889, took ship for India on their way back to Europe.

The scientific part of the mission seems to have consisted in the attempt to find and copy more of the ancient Vannic cuneiform inscriptions, of which sixty-eight had already been published. They found a few, which Prof. Hyvernat succeeded in copying, and saw and heard of a number of others, thirty in all, several of which had been reported before. Neither texts nor contents of these inscriptions are published in this volume, but only two lists of the edited and inedited inscriptions respectively. Besides these lists, M. Hyvernat furnishes a brief résumé of the history of ancient Armenia as ascertained from the Assyrian and Vannic inscriptions. A memoir which he prepared

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

on the ancient geography of Armenia, and which is announced on the title-page as among the contents of the volume, was lost in transmission through the mails.

The remaining contents of the 628 pages are a narrative of the journey, with occasional historical allusions, a review of the condition of the Roman Catholic missions in the region visited, and reflections on the social and political conditions. M. Simonis was obliged to depend entirely on Roman Catholic missionaries and converts for his information, and hence naturally writes from the point of view of those missions. Otherwise he seems to be fair-minded and impartial. He is rather bitter against the American Presbyterian missionaries in Persia, regarding their religious influence as very bad, and insinuating that in the past, at least, they have intrigued against the Roman Catholics; but their philanthropic labors he estimates highly, especially the reform they have wrought in the drinking habits of the people about Urumia. The English mission to the Nestorians he appears to regard as Roman in all but the name.

From the political point of view Russia is his *bête noire*, for Russian conquest would mean death to Roman Catholic missions. He draws a comparison between Russian administration of the Caucasus and English administration of India, altogether in favor of the latter. But, on the other hand, he frankly shows that Russian rule is to be preferred to either Turkish or Persian. Again, his sympathies are with the Russian methods of handling the Turks, and he strongly condemns the present English policy. The travellers experienced more than the ordinary difficulties with the Turkish officials at Van, and much of the narrative is a recital of those difficulties, and the stupidity, rascality, and corruption of Turkish administration. Of the life of the people they could, of course, obtain but a cursory glimpse. M. Simonis never feels himself bound by obligations of hospitality, and relates all he sees and hears among the European residents. Somewhat inconsequentially he reproaches the English consulate at Bagdad with smuggling antiquities out of the country, and relates a rather improbable story of the use of the English gunboat in that service; and then almost in the same breath he narrates how his party secured and smuggled out antiquities by the help of the French Consul. He is occasionally careless about names, and not sufficiently careful about his sources; but in general, making allowance for the bias referred to above, he is accurate and trustworthy.

M. Simonis furnishes a good map of their route through Caucasus, Persia, and Armenia, being Kiepert's map with a few corrections from their own observations. The map of the lower part of the Euphrates and Tigris valleys, however, had better never have been published. It is an inaccurate and poor copy of earlier maps, with no corrections. Some of the most important ruin sites of the country, rendered famous by recent English, French, and German excavations, such as Abu Habbah, Deir, Tello, Zerghul, Hibbah, and Abu Shahrein, are not indicated, while mythical or unimportant sites, like Serasovbli and Khirfan, are prominent. The ancient Assyrian Stagnum by Nejef, which was drained some years since, is represented here as a great lake. Nasriyeh, one of the most important towns of the whole country, is omitted altogether; so is Shatra, another town of consequence, while Samawa, following former errors, is located on Shatt 'Ateshan, instead of on the Euphrates. These are but a few errors out of many.

The volume is a quarto, printed in large, very loosely spaced type, with beautiful margins. It bears the mark of the Imprimerie Alsacienne, Strassburg. It is profusely illustrated; and many of the cuts and phototypes representing Armenian architecture and racial types are of permanent value. The full-page phototypes were executed from M. Müller-Simonis's photographs by Obernetter of Munich. One of these, representing Ctesiphon, has been reversed, so that the façade is represented on the right instead of on the left side of the great arch. Any book about Armenia and the Caucasus is timely at the present moment, and not least this present work; but, while edifying and instructive, the text scarcely justifies the size and magnificence of the volume.

Histoire des États-Unis de l'Amérique du Nord depuis la Découverte du Nouveau Continent jusqu'à nos jours. Par Auguste Moireau. I. La Période Coloniale, pp. 584. II. Les États-Unis de 1776 à 1800, pp. 504. Paris: Hachette & Co. 1892.

M. MOIREAU'S history of the United States is laid out on an ample scale: the two volumes so far published come down only to the election of Thomas Jefferson, and it is to be expected that the complete work will fill at least eight volumes of more than 500 large octavo pages each. This is even more voluminous than the work of M. Carlier, which we reviewed last year, and which is not primarily historical, but rather expository and descriptive, like Prof. Bryce's book.

The only foreign work concerning our country which can compare in bulk with the one before us is Von Holst's History, but that does not undertake to cover the whole ground, as Moireau has set out to do. Although the French historian makes no pretence of having gone to original sources, but seems to have consulted only the printed authorities accessible to everybody, it by no means follows that his work is one of supererogation, or that there is no field for it to occupy. It will not only form a convenient and attractive manual for French readers, who can nowhere else find so full and accurate an account, but may even prove valuable to Americans inasmuch as, strange to say, we have no work by a single author covering our whole history. In history, as in all science, the prevailing tendency is to specialism: each writer devotes himself to a special period or to a special aspect of history, such as constitutional development, and the like. The recent work of Mr. Henry Adams is a case in point; its great value has been universally recognized, but if the whole history of the United States were to be developed on the scale laid down by Bancroft and by Adams, very few of us could hope to become acquainted with it in the course of a lifetime, even without attempting the history of any European country. What we still lack is a continuous history of our country from the beginning to the present day, written in a readable style, observing a due proportion in the relative space accorded to the various periods, not too bulky to warn away the general reader, but not so condensed as to crowd the incidents or the actors in them, and forming a harmonious whole such as can be expected only in a work emanating from a single mind devoted to its subject and saturated with it. Such a book we may never get, but, in the meantime, we must be glad to put up with what M. Moireau offers us. He would seem to have had some such ideal aim before him as is hinted at above, and he is certainly entitled to all the encouragement Americans can give him.

He has undoubtedly made a diligent study of everything that has appeared in print concerning the United States; he has his reading well in hand, and presents the results of it in a smooth and attractive style. He not only describes effectively the military and political incidents, but gives us sketches of character and chapters on social and literary conditions such as Macaulay used with such striking effect. It is true that he does not bring out anything new; but that is not to be expected after the microscopic survey to which the various detached portions of the field have been subjected by our specialists. He has taken pains, however, to keep himself informed of the most recent researches even concerning minor points, as, for instance, the controversy in regard to the authorship of the Kentucky Resolutions. One reproach to which he is open is that he does not always manage very skilfully the difficult task of synchronous narration. He will bring one part of the story down to a certain year in one chapter, and in the next will hark back ten or fifteen years to take up another thread and carry that forward. This is more particularly noticeable in the accounts of the separate colonies, which could perhaps have been arranged somewhat differently and less confusingly. The real test of his ability as an historian will have to be applied to the later volumes, when he will be relegated to the conflicting contemporaneous accounts to be found only in partisan newspapers, and will have to be guided in his selection of facts by the intuitive insight which is as necessary an outfit for the great historian as it is for the poet. What he has done so far warrants the expectation that he will acquit himself at least creditably of the task he has undertaken.

BOOKS OF THE WEEK.

Acland, A. H. D., and Smith, H. L. Studies in Secondary Education. Macmillan. $1.75.
Barrie, J. M. A Window in Thrums. Cassell. 25 cents.
Bayfield, M. A. The Medea of Euripides. Macmillan. 40 cents.
Bernard, H. M. The Apodidæ: A Morphological Study. Macmillan. $2.
Bowen, C. W. The Centennial of Washington's Inauguration. Appletons.
Crawford, F. M. A Tale of a Lonely Parish. Macmillan. $1.
Dawes, Miss A. L. Charles Sumner. [Makers of America.] Dodd, Mead & Co. $1.
Dickens, Charles. Oliver Twist. Macmillan,. $1.
Du Bois, Constance G. Columbus and Beatriz. Chicago: A. C. McClurg & Co. $1.
Du Bose, Prof. W. P. The Soteriology of the New Testament. Macmillan. $1.50.
Earle, Alice M. China Collecting in America. Scribners. $3.
Edwards, Joseph. An Elementary Treatise on the Differential Calculus. 2d ed. Macmillan. $3.50.
Evans, Taliesin. American Citizenship; and the Right of Suffrage in the United States. Oakland, Cal.: *Tribune* Print.
Fisher, Prof. G. P. The Colonial Era. Scribners. $1.25.
Freeman, Prof. E. A. The History of Sicily. Vol. III. Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York: Macmillan. $6.
Froude, J. A. The Spanish Story of the Armada, and Other Essays. Scribners. $1.50.
Fullerton, Prof. G. S. The Philosophy of Spinoza. Henry Holt & Co. $1.20.
Gardener, Helen H. Pushed by Unseen Hands. Commonwealth Co. $1.
Gautherot, A. A Rational French Method. W. R. Jenkins.
Gell, Mrs. Lyttelton. The Cloud of Witness. Oxford: University Press; New York: Macmillan. $1.25.
Glyn, A. L. Fifty Pounds for a Wife. Henry Holt & Co. $1.
Greswell, Rev. W. P. Geography of Africa South of the Zambesi. Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York: Macmillan. $2.
Grey, Earl. The Commercial Policy of the British Colonies and the McKinley Tariff. Macmillan. 30 cents.
Güntter, Prof. Otto. Walther von der Vogelweide. Stuttgart: G. J. Göschen; New York: International News Co.
Haggard, H. Rider. Nada the Lily. Longmans, Green & Co. $1.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Hale, Rev. E. E., and Lucretia P. The New Harry and Lucy. Boston: Roberts Bros. $1.25.
Halévy, Ludovic. Karikari, etc. Paris: Calmann Lévy; New York: Westermann.
Hall, Prof. J. L. Beowulf: An Anglo-Saxon Epic Poem. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co.
Harrison, Mrs. Burton. A Daughter of the South, and Shorter Stories. Cassell. $1.
Harvard Studies in Classical Philology. Vol. III. Boston: Ginn & Co. $1.50.
Hatch, Edwin, and Redpath, H. A. A Concordance to the Septuagint, etc. Part I. A—ΒΩΡΙΘ. Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York: Macmillan. $5.
Hazlitt, William. Lectures on the English Poets. Dodd, Mead & Co. $1.25.
Heimburg, W. A Poor Girl. Worthington Co.
Henley, W. E. The Song of the Sword, and Other Verses. Scribners. $1.
Hibbard, George A. The Governor, and Other Stories. Scribners. $1.
Hill, G. B. Letters of Dr. Samuel Johnson. 2 vols. Harpers.
Hughes, Rev. Thomas. Loyola, and the Educational System of the Jesuits. [The Great Educators.] Scribners. $1.
Hunt, Prof. T. W. Ethical Teachings in Old English Literature. Funk & Wagnalls Co. $1.25.
Hurst, G. H. Silk Dyeing, Printing, and Finishing. London: George Bell & Sons; New York: Macmillan. $2.
Hutton, A. W. Cardinal Manning. London: Methuen & Co.
Johns, Rev. B. G. Among the Butterflies: A Book for Young Collectors. Thomas Whittaker. $1.
Johnson, E. G. The Best Letters of Charles Lamb. Chicago: A. C. McClurg & Co. $1.
Jousselin, Stéphanie. Yankees Fin de Siècle. Paris: P. Ollendorf.
Julian, George W. The Life of Joshua R. Giddings. Chicago: A. C. McClurg & Co. $2.50.
Kipling, R. Ballads, and Barrack-Room Ballads. Macmillan. $1.25.
Landauer, J. Blowpipe Analysis. Macmillan. $1.10.
Lathrop, G. P. Dreams and Days. Scribners. $1.75.
L'Estrange, Miles. What We are Coming to. Edinburgh: David Douglas.
Lewis, Mrs. Harriet. Edith Trevor's Secret. Robert Bonner's Sons. $1.
Lewis, Mrs. Harriet. Cecil Rosse: A Sequel to Edith Trevor's Secret. Robert Bonner's Sons. $1.
Lhomme, F. Les Femmes Ecrivains. Œuvres choisies. [Bibliothèque Littéraire de la Famille.] Paris; Librairie de L'Art; New York: Macmillan.
Lhomme, F. Raffet. [Les Artistes Célèbres.] Paris: Librairie de L'Art; New York: Macmillan.
Lias, Rev. J. J. II. Corinthians. [Cambridge Greek Testament.] Cambridge, Eng.: University Press: New York: Macmillan. 90 cents.
Linton, W. J. The Masters of Wood Engraving. New Haven: W. J. Linton; London: B. F. Stevens. $50.
Mahaffy, J. P. The Principles of the Art of Conversation. Philadelphia: Penn Publishing Co. 50 cents.
Marold, K. Hartmann von Aue, Wolfram von Eschenbach und Gottfried von Strassburg. Stuttgart: G. J. Göschen; New York: International News Co.
Marshall, Prof. Alfred. Elements of Economics of Industry. Macmillan. $1.
Meserole, A. Selections from the *Spectator*. E. P. Dutton & Co. $1.25.
Mivart, St. George. Essays and Criticisms. 2 vols. Boston: Little, Brown & Co. $8.
Morris, R. Anna. Physical Education in the Public Schools. American Book Co. $1.
Morton, Agnes H. Correspondence. Philadelphia: Penn Publishing Co. 50 cents.
Moulton, Louise Chandler. Swallow Flights. Boston: Roberts Bros. $1.25.
Munnell, Rev. W. H. Glimpses of Heaven. Philadelphia: J. Y. Huber Co. $1.
Nall, G. H. Easy Exercises on First Greek Syntax. Macmillan. 60 cents.
Nasmith, David. Makers of Modern Thought. 2 vols. London: George Philip & Son.
Otis, James. The Braganza Diamond. Philadelphia: Penn Publishing Co. $1.25.
Parry, Major G. The Story of Dick. Macmillan. $1.
Pascoe, Charles E. London of To-Day. Boston: Roberts Bros.
Peacock, T. L. Crotchet Castle. London: J. M. Dent & Co.; New York: Macmillan. $1.
Phyfe, W. H. P. The Test-Pronouncer. Putnams. 75 cents.
Pittenger, William. The Debater's Treasury. Philadelphia: Penn Publishing Co. 50 cents.
Pollock, Sir F. Leading Cases Done into English, and Other Diversions. Macmillan. $1.
Poor, Laura E. The First International Railway, etc. Life and Writings of John Alfred Poor. Putnams. $3.
Porter, L. H. Wheels and Wheeling. Boston: Wheelman Co. 75 cents.
Puttner, Bertha von. Ground Arms: the Story of a Life. Chicago: A. C. McClurg & Co. $1.
Reade, Amye. Slaves of the Sawdust. Hovenden Co. $1.
Robertson, J. M. The Fallacy of Saving. London: Sonnenschein; New York: Scribners. $1.
Rowland, Kate Mason. The Life of George Mason. 1725–1792. 2 vols. Putnams. $8.
Ruskin, J. Stones of Venice. 2 vols. [Brantwood Edition.] Charles E. Merrill & Co. $3.
Sherwood, Mrs. M. E. W. The Art of Entertaining. Dodd, Mead & Co. $1.50.
Villars, P. The Escapes of Casanova and Latude from Prison. [The Adventure Series.] Macmillan. $1.50.
Wallace, Prof. P. M. Tennyson's Princess. Macmillan. 75 cents.
Waterloo, Stanley. A Man and a Woman. Chicago: F. J. Shulte & Co.
Weed, Clarence M. Spraying Crops: Why, When and How. New York: Rural Publishing Co.
Whitehouse, W. F. The Redemption of the Body. London: Elliot Stock.
Winter, W. Shakspere's England, New ed. Macmillan. 75 cents.
Yonge, Charlotte M. That Stick. Macmillan. $1.

"*An original and striking novel.*"

£50 for a Wife.

By A. L. GLYN.

"A curious story, perhaps most interesting from the novelty of its plot. The characters are well drawn."—*Boston Times.*

Cloth, $1; paper, 50 cents, postpaid.

Paganism and Christianity

By J. A. FARRAR. 12mo.

A striking and revolutionary book, presenting a comparison of Christianity with the faiths of Greece and Rome, and demonstrating many points of correspondence and sympathy not generally realized.

HENRY HOLT & CO., N. Y.

A Guide to Homœopathic Practice

Designed for the use of families and private individuals. By J. D. JOHNSON, M.D. 494 pages. 8vo. Cloth, $2.00.

A most reliable and useful book to have in the house.

BOERICKE & TAFEL,

Homœopathic Publishers and Pharmacists,

1011 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

Business established in 1835.

FOR ADVANCED CLASSES ONLY, or for all desirous of keeping up their French, L'ECHO LITTERAIRE, a school and home French European Magazine. Romance, poetry, plays, sketches, exercises, etc. Twice a month. Nearly 800 pages, postpaid, at $1.25 per annum.

E. ROTH, 337 South Broad St., Phila.

5 cents a single number.

Make Two Hundred

CAKES with Royal Baking Powder and every one will be whiter, sweeter, lighter, finer flavored, more delicious and wholesome than cakes made with any other baking powder.

The last spoonful in a can of Royal Baking Powder will be found as good as the first, and the last cake will be as light as the first, because the Royal has keeping qualities which all others lack.

A spoonful of Royal will go further than a spoonful of any other powder because it is the purest.

Exhaustion.

HORSFORD'S

ACID PHOSPHATE.

A wonderful remedy, of the highest value in mental and nervous exhaustion.

Overworked men and women, the nervous, weak, and debilitated, will find in the Acid Phosphate a most agreeable, grateful, and harmless stimulant, giving renewed strength and vigor to the entire system.

Dr. Edwin F. Vose, Portland, Me., says: "I have used it in my own case when suffering from nervous exhaustion, with gratifying results. I have prescribed it for many of the various forms of nervous debility, and it has never failed to do good."

Descriptive pamphlet free.

Rumford Chemical Works, Providence, R. I.

Beware of Substitutes and Imitations.

CAUTION: Be sure the word "Horsford's" is on the label. All others are spurious. Never sold in bulk.

"The weary brain requires some nerve sustaining element as food."—HERBERT SPENCER.

Crosby's Vitalized Phosphites.

The vital principle of animal and vegetable life isolated from the ox brain and wheat germ.

The loss of memory, the tired and exhausted feeling, the dull, unrefreshed sleep, or nervous sleeplessness, brain weariness, depressed vitality, are simply the brain and nervous system calling for their necessary food. In this condition the Vitalized Phosphites give great relief. It restores the true protagon, the brain phosphoid, increases brain and nerve power by specially feeding the nerve centres. It reinvigorates brain and body.

For thirty years endorsed by leading physcians, and the world's best brain workers. Formula on the label. Piamphlet free to those who write for it. Druggists or by mail, $1.00. 56 W. 25th St., N. Y. *F. Crosby Co.*

BACK NUMBERS, VOLUMES, OR sets of leading and scarce magazines, etc., for sale by H. WILLIAMS, 195 West 10th St., N. Y.

BACK NUMBERS OF MAGAZINES and Reviews, early and recent. Correspondence solicited. A. H. ROPPS & Co., Boston, Mass.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED